

lead in dealing with the Cyprus problem. Had action along the lines called for by this resolution been taken by the United Nations at that time, I am sure that much bloodshed and suffering might have been avoided.

I am well aware that the release of Archbishop Makarios from confinement does not solve the Cyprus problem. The hatreds and bitterness which have been engendered during recent years will make any satisfactory

solution difficult. Nevertheless, I am hopeful that a turning point has been reached, and I am sure that the United States stands ready to use its good offices and render assistance whenever an opportunity arises.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1957

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal and ever-blessed God, may we now be of one mind with all who seek Thee; of one heart with all who love Thee; of one fellowship with all who worship Thee in spirit and in truth; of one purpose with all who serve Thee in faithfulness and joy.

Help us to believe and feel that Thou art our light in times of darkness; our strength in days of struggle and weakness; our companion and consolation in hours of bitter loneliness and deepest sorrow.

Grant that in these days of confusion and tension, the hard facts and harsh experiences of life may not break our hearts and blast our faith.

Hear us in the name of Him who, being Lord of all, was willing for our sakes to become the servant of all. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### AMENDING CONSTITUTION SO AS TO LIMIT FEDERAL TAXING POWER

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, about 2 weeks ago, the last of the required two-thirds of the States ratified a resolution calling on Congress to order a constitutional convention for the purpose of amending our Constitution so as to limit our Federal taxing power.

This request for a constitutional convention cannot be treated too lightly. In view of the present rebellious temper of the American taxpayers, I am certain that a strong demand will be made insisting on a tax-ceiling amendment. And I assure the Members of this Congress that once such an amendment is proposed, speedy ratification by the required three-fourths of the States will follow.

Therefore, this recent legislative action by the 32d State raises a very serious and important question which requires an immediate answer.

If Congress considers itself legally bound to call such a convention, which

I believe it is under article V of the Constitution, and such an amendment should be adopted by three-fourths of the States, which I also believe will happen, then, how will the Government make up its revenue losses?

The solution to this problem lies within reach of the Members of this Congress. The immediate consideration and enactment of my bill, H. R. 3520, will help solve this disturbing problem. My bill will not only establish a national lottery, regulated, supervised, and controlled by our Federal Government, but it will bring into our Treasury \$10 billion. This tremendous new revenue which is waiting to be legally tapped will replenish most of the losses that will be sustained by reason of a limitation on our taxing powers.

The Members of this Congress cannot afford to wait until we are compelled to accept this mandate from the American taxpayers. Failure to act now can only place us in a precarious position. I implore the Members of this Congress not to ignore this situation. Delay can only result in placing this Government in a sad state of affairs.

Now is the time for us to exercise wise judgment by giving serious and immediate attention to my proposal for a national lottery. I urge this Congress to act now before it is too late.

### REDUCE THE BUDGET

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am highly pleased to be getting so many letters from folks back home asking me to do everything possible to reduce the budget. I really appreciated these letters, Mr. Speaker, for I, too, am concerned and I quote from my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD made on the floor of Congress on January 22, 1957:

This enormous budget worries all of us. I feel when our income is at its highest, that is the time to pay on our debt.

May I repeat what I have often said:

We will continue to have good government at all levels just so long as citizens maintain an active interest in all the affairs of government.

I recognize it is difficult to cut expenses when we get so many letters from our people requesting Federal funds for better schools, better roads, better hospitals, more and greater benefits from social security and other departments of assistance. Possibly they are right in their requests, Mr. Speaker, but when we have a budget that costs at the rate of \$416 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, it is time for us to stop, look, and listen.

There are many places where the budget can be cut. I believe it is time, and in my opinion, long past due to greatly reduce, even completely cut out, the giveaway program in the field of foreign aid. As of this date we have reduced various items of expenditures in an amount equal to approximately three-quarters of a billion dollars. I have talked to many department heads who have had their respective budgets cut and they have assured me that every effort will be made to give efficiency of operation. However, there are a great many people who do not seem to realize there is no such thing as free money. We must remember that every dollar we spend must be taken from the pockets of the taxpayer. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it is time we clean house, put a stop to these new bureaus; yes, even some of the new committees that have been established in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States. We cannot ask other bureaus to cut expenses unless we are willing to do likewise. The philosophy of tax and tax, and spend and spend, if carried on, will mean the downfall of this great Republic.

Higher taxes mean less take-home pay.

### ORGANIZATION FOR TRADE COOPERATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 146)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Secretary of Commerce is submitting for consideration by the Congress legislation to authorize United States membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation.

I urge its favorable consideration.

The advantages to the United States of membership in the Organization for Trade Cooperation are compelling. It would open the way to major benefits for American trade by providing day-to-day review and consultation on administration of our trade agreements. It would provide machinery for closer supervision and protection of the assurances contained in those agreements against discriminatory treatment of American exports, and thus increase the benefits we receive from those agreements. It would enable us more effectively to encourage the opening of new opportunities for our exports to compete in the world market on their commercial merit.

Foreign trade is a major economic activity in the United States. In 1956 our merchandise exports, excluding

goods shipped under military assistance programs, amounted to over \$17 billion. They constituted a greater proportion of our gross national product than the value of all nonfarm residential construction last year. In the field of agriculture alone exports provide the market for the product of about 40 million acres of land.

Because exports take only part of the production of most of our industries and farms, and because they move through so many stages of processing and handling on their way to foreign markets, we frequently overlook their importance. But they are vital to the welfare of our agriculture, labor, and industry.

America's foreign trade has grown rapidly under our reciprocal trade agreements program. This program has been in effect for more than 20 years, but since 1946 its principal vehicle has been a multilateral agreement known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, signed by all the major trading nations of the world.

That agreement gives to the United States important tariff and other concessions, but some of the benefits of these concessions to our export trade have been offset by such measures as quotas, licenses, and exchange restrictions. These measures have under various circumstances had the effect of discriminating against United States exports, and limiting the benefits of tariff concessions which we received under the general agreement.

The general agreement provides for the orderly elimination of this discrimination against our trade, but, because of inadequate machinery for administration, these provisions have not been fully effective.

The Organization for Trade Cooperation, by making possible more business-like administration of those provisions of the general agreement, will help to make our trade agreements more fully effective and assist us in expanding our markets abroad for United States products. At the present time, administration of the general agreement is limited by the fact that the signatories meet only intermittently.

In my message of April 14, 1955, I reviewed the evolution of the general agreement and the developments which led to the proposal for an organization for trade cooperation. That message was followed by exhaustive hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and in April 1956 that committee approved a bill to authorize United States membership in the proposed organization.

In reporting last year's bill the Committee on Ways and Means inserted a number of constructive amendments to assure that participation by the United States in the Organization for Trade Cooperation would relate solely to matters pertaining to international trade and that safeguards for domestic producers contained in our present trade legislation would be maintained unimpaired. These amendments have been strengthened and included in this year's bill.

The proposal being submitted by the Secretary of Commerce contains two

new features not found in the bill approved by the Committee on Ways and Means last year. These are designed to provide further safeguards to insure that United States participation in the proposed Organization will be responsive to the problems and needs of American agriculture, labor, and industry. The first is a provision to create an advisory committee consisting of representatives of American labor, industry, agriculture, and the public to advise and consult with the United States chief representative on matters coming before the Organization. The second is a provision under which the United States chief representative would make an annual report to the President for transmittal to the Congress concerning the effect of the activities of the Organization for Trade Cooperation on American labor, industry, and agriculture.

In addition, the proposal contains provisions further clarifying the substantive safeguards already endorsed by the Committee on Ways and Means by explicitly stating that its enactment will not authorize, directly or indirectly, any further tariff reduction or other tariff concession by the United States not elsewhere authorized by the Congress.

The recent development of proposals for a common market and free-trade area place Western Europe on the threshold of a great new movement toward economic integration. The OTC will help to assure that this movement will develop in ways beneficial to our trade and that of other free countries, avoiding the danger that regional trade arrangement will lead to new barriers and discriminations against our exports.

To achieve our objectives, it is essential that the United States chief representative to the Organization for Trade Cooperation be a person of wide experience in practical business matters, and that the members of the advisory committee likewise have had practical experience in their respective fields. I intend to appoint the Secretary of Commerce as chairman of the advisory committee.

The foreign-trade policies of the United States are based upon our reciprocal-trade legislation and the agreements that have been negotiated under it. Until we establish the best possible machinery for administration of these agreements, we are needlessly failing to obtain their maximum possible benefits for American labor, industry, and agriculture. With membership in the proposed OTC we will be in the strongest possible position to achieve the full benefits that these agreements afford.

I recommend the early enactment of this proposal.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

The WHITE HOUSE, April 3, 1957.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Anderson, Mont.	Cretella Davis, Tenn.	Gregory Holtzman
Andresen, August H.	Dawson, Ill.	Kelley, Pa.
Aspinall	Dies	Norrell
Blitch	Eberhart	Powell
Bowler	Engle	Prouty
Celler	Fallon	Reece, Tenn.
	Green, Pa.	Thomson, Wyo.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 411 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

#### DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES, APPROPRIATION BILL, 1958

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 6287, with Mr. FORAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, there was pending the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, strike out line 1 through line 4.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I must rise in opposition to this amendment that has been introduced by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER]. First, I want to commend the subcommittee on the fine work that it has done in the preparation of this bill, and also the fine work that is being done by so many of the Members who, just as I am, are interested in showing and practicing some economy in our Government. But always there is the recurring and ever-present problem of where we are to economize; how much and where shall we make these cuts.

Now, I wonder if it would not be well to look briefly at this program of water-pollution control and see if this is really a wise area to affect economies. Let us see just how this program works and what it does.

So many of us are apt to think of the program as being just another Federal giveaway; as a program where some officials of the Federal Government decide it would be a nice thing to build a sewage-disposal plant out at Timbuktu or somewhere, and then they go out there and they build a fine new sewage-dis-



posals plant. That is not the program we have under consideration here today.

This program is a participation program in which the Federal Government, after careful scrutiny on the part of local and State authorities, will come in under proper conditions and participate financially up to 30 percent or \$250,000, whichever is less, in effectuating needed water-pollution controls. The appropriation is allocated to the individual States, and the local authorities decide upon the merit of the projects.

Now, what does this amount to? It is simply that the health authorities at State level must approve these projects. The projects under this program must meet certain criteria, an important one of which is the Federal impaction problem caused by our national defense installations in particular areas.

Now, I heard the distinguished gentleman from Indiana yesterday in his very able presentation in support of this amendment say that "This is indeed a meritorious program, but like so many of these programs we are going to have to postpone it to another day, when the burdens of national defense are not so great upon us." I, of course, can appreciate this viewpoint, but I feel that it is not applicable in this particular instance because, first, this program directly affects national defense in many instances; and, secondly, because this program cannot be postponed until another day.

Let me give you a brief example of a situation that happened to exist right in my congressional district. We have one of the largest naval air-training stations in the world located on a peninsula surrounded by Corpus Christi Bay on one side, Laguna Madre on another, and a little shallow backbay called Oso on the other side. Now on the opposite side of the Oso from this great naval station is a sewage-disposal plant called the Oso Bay Sewage Disposal Plant of the city of Corpus Christi. This plant has become overburdened because of the impaction of the area, partly caused by the naval air station. As a result there has been pumped hundreds of thousands of gallons of raw sewage into this Oso Bay, which in part includes the naval air station, causing a great threat to the health of all who lived and worked nearby. The Water Pollution Control Act is designed to help eliminate situations like this. The problem is just as simple and serious as this. The solution to this type of problem cannot wait until tomorrow. When we have a sewage plant and it becomes overburdened, the sewage must go in a raw state into the bay or river into which it drains, and when the sewage mains become overburdened, they simply will not carry any more and the commodes back up. And thus we have a situation that causes an extremely serious health problem not only to civilians, but to the military personnel in the adjacent areas.

It is well enough to talk of putting off a solution to this problem until a future date, but the problem is with us today. It was with us yesterday and it will be with us tomorrow and the days following. This problem cannot be put off until tomorrow, unless this distinguished body feels that it can legislate such a

radical alteration of human phenomena that we will no longer have a need for sewage disposal plants. The menacing situation which I have described existing in the area near the Naval Air Station in Corpus Christi is repeated in many other areas throughout the 14th Congressional District of Texas and is directly traceable to the unusual impaction caused by the location of military installations in the area.

It is indeed unreasonable for this Congress or for the Federal Government to expect our cities and our towns to be able to handle the added burden of sewage disposal and other matters that are caused by the presence of our military personnel and their dependents in ever-increasing numbers. The 30-percent Federal participation in the solution of this problem is certainly little enough for the Federal Government to pay as its part of the share of protecting the health and the well-being of the military personnel and the civilians who live in these polluted areas. We have many fine cities in the 14th Congressional District of Texas and many other places in the United States who are indeed proud to have in their community the military personnel of this country, but who, nonetheless, are in vital need of the 30-percent Federal assistance in matters of water pollution control in order that they can assure the health of the people in their communities and in their vicinities.

I have in my district the city of New Braunfels, whose application for \$75,000 was approved on March 28. I have within my district the city of Mathis whose application for \$31,500 was approved March 27. I have on application the city of Corpus Christi for \$250,000; the city of Beeville for \$84,300; and the city of Poteet for \$21,150.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to bring to the attention of this distinguished body that these good, hard-working people are not asking the Federal Government to come down and build these public facilities for them, but are actually asking the Federal Government merely to participate to the extent of its obligation to the people who are in this area.

Bear in mind that these cities are putting up more than 70 percent of the total cost of these projects, and the Federal Government's participation is not, and cannot under the law, exceed 30 percent. If there ever was an area where the Federal Government not only has a right, but a direct responsibility to participate in assisting in the protection of the health of the people of a community, it is in those areas where there is intense Federal impaction that makes it impossible for the local interests to carry the burden without assistance.

In conclusion then, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that the Water Pollution Control Act is one of the most important matters affecting public health that will come before this body; that it has an extremely important and direct defense aspect; and that it is designed to correct problems which exist today, the solution of which cannot be put off to a future day.

I therefore respectfully submit, Mr. Chairman, that this distinguished body

should give careful consideration to this most serious problem confronting the public health of this Nation, and as long as this Government is sending billions of dollars overseas to protect the health and welfare of foreigners on foreign soil, that we do not practice the unwise and foolish economy of depriving our own people at home of this public-health protection. It would indeed be a disgrace for us to strike from the appropriations bill this sum of money which is used for the Federal Government to pay its share of the responsibility to its people, when, at the same time, in the President's budget is contained more than \$4 billion designated to go overseas for the use of the people on foreign shores.

Again, I desire to commend those Members who, like myself, are interested in economizing in our governmental operations, but I would caution that we be wise in our economies, just as we should be wise in our expenditures, and let us do nothing that is going to endanger the public health of this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to see if I can find out from the chairman of the subcommittee how many rollcalls he expects to ask for and on which amendments.

Mr. FOGARTY. Up to this time we expect to have eight rollcalls on amendments that have been adopted.

Mr. MORANO. Does the gentleman expect to ask for those rollcalls?

Mr. FOGARTY. Those amendments have already been adopted. The number of additional rollcalls will depend upon the additional amendments that are adopted while we are in the Committee of the Whole. The pending one is an example. If this amendment is adopted, we will have a rollcall on that.

Mr. MORANO. Would the gentleman tell us what the amendments are, what the issues are?

Mr. FOGARTY. The first amendment on which we will have a rollcall would be the Smith amendment, which cut the amount for the Solicitor's Office in the Department of Labor.

The second is the Budget amendment which cut the Bureau of Veterans' Reemployment Rights Division.

The third would be the Smith amendment cutting the Bureau of Employment Security, Salaries and Expenses, which money does not come out of the Federal Treasury.

The fourth would be the so-called Murray amendment which cut the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The fifth would be the Andersen amendment which cut the Women's Bureau.

The sixth would be the Hébert amendment which cut the Wage and Hour Division.

The seventh would be the so-called Jonas amendment which cut the appropriation for the Food and Drug Administration.

The eighth is the so-called Dorn amendment that was adopted on yesterday, cutting salaries for the Office of Education.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman does not intend to ask for a rollcall on the amendment which struck out the \$200,000 for the President's Committee?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; because of the lack of interest shown yesterday. If anyone else desires to ask for a rollcall, that is perfectly satisfactory to me. I would be glad to help the gentleman get a rollcall on any of them.

Mr. MORANO. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FOGARTY. Would the gentleman yield to me for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MORANO. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 15 minutes, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, by a strenuous effort yesterday I restrained myself all day long, and I would like to have 5 minutes today.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I regret to find myself in opposition to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] who offered this amendment. But certainly I think this represents, if approved, the death of a very fine program, one in which the Members of this House were very much interested as recently as some 9 months ago. Yesterday, during the debate, a number of times I thought it would have been appropriate had the Sons of the Pioneers been available here to give us a rendition of the song, Cool, Clear Water, because we heard a lot of talk yesterday about cool, clear water. I think all of us are in agreement that it is the most vital and essential natural resource we possess.

One of the principal reasons for my asking for this time, though, was to clarify the position of some of us in California with reference to the construction of Federal projects. My friend and colleague from California [Mr. SCUDDER] in answer to a question by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] yesterday afternoon seemed to feel that we in California would have been better off had we not had the advantages of a number of those projects. I for one must vigorously disagree with my colleague from California.

At this time I want to express my deep appreciation and my thanks to all the Members of this House who from time to time have supported the construction, the authorization, and the appropriation of moneys for the development of those great projects which we enjoy in Cali-

fornia. It has contributed to the development of that great State and has made it possible today for us to pay in an amount of some 10 percent of the total Federal taxes collected in this country. They have paid for themselves tenfold. They are outstanding projects. I and the people I represent in the central part of California, in the San Joaquin Valley and in the Sacramento Valley, up and down that great State, are deeply appreciative of the fact that they were able under Federal legislation to enjoy the benefits we are so proud of there.

Further, I should like to comment with reference to the idea of permitting the purchase by the State of California of those projects. It is my firm conviction that 80 to 90 percent of the people in that State would oppose such a program and certainly it would be my hope that no such proposal would ever come before this House.

In the moment or two that remains to me I should like to call your attention to what I believe to be some reasons for the need for this \$50 million appropriation called for in this appropriation bill. There has been a great shifting of the tax base. The municipalities today are squeezed for a tax base. We have school districts and we have other districts which are taxing the present base. Also, the shift of the tax to the Federal level has squeezed many of our States and the municipal groups to a position where they just no longer have a tax base sufficient to grant them the money necessary to do a lot of this work.

Certainly I am in agreement that if and when the time ever comes that we at the Federal level can adjust our thinking and begin to reduce in substantial measure a lot of these Federal taxes and return to the States and to the municipalities and to the counties some of that tax base, then I think we shall be in a position to do a little better job at the local level than we are doing at present. But as long as the Federal Government is taking such a big bite out of the tax base, it becomes an impossibility for these municipalities to do the jobs they should do.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The Member from the Fourth District of Michigan should know something about pollution having lived for many years on the St. Joe River which originates in Michigan and flows down through a part of northwestern Indiana, then back up into Michigan and on into Lake Michigan at St. Joe and Benton Harbor. Also on the Kalamazoo where, if you will look at the October 1953 issue of Life, you will see acres and tons of dead fish, killed by pollution.

The remarks of the chairman remind me of the statement in the Scriptures. This is the seventh day of debate. The Scriptures say that in 6 days the Lord made heaven and earth and all therein but on the seventh day the Lord rested. He evidently found the result of his labor to be good. It is just possible that if we strike the enacting clause of this bill and send it back to committee with recommendations, we may find our 6 days labor better than what we now have before us.

Going back to the Kalamazoo River. It happens that a creek that empties into the Kalamazoo flows through a farm which it is my privilege to own. Down at the mouth of the creek—Dumont Creek, if you look at the October 1953 issue of Life you will see where there is at least an acre and perhaps several acres of dead fish killed by pollution of the river. The city and the State will take care of that situation with any money for sewers. But this bill which is before us here, if I get it correct, is not one about pollution, it is about building sewers and who shall pay the cost thereof—indirectly, of course, it relates to pollution because all sewage tends in that direction. The people along the rivers have a remedy, a legal remedy, and it is adequate if enforced against the people who cause pollution. The people who live along the upper stretches of a river have no more right to pollute that water than I have to go to your home and throw a bucket, let us say, of swill—those who know about feeding pigs years ago know what swill is—and throw it through the back or even through the front door of your home. So that remedy is available. Another thing. We all recall that the Founding Fathers thought it was a good thing for this to be a government by the people. To reserve to the people and to the States all the authority not granted by the Constitution to the Federal Government. Here the Congress day after day and year after year surrenders, bit by bit, that sovereign power of the people and the State to the Federal Government.

It is surprising and startling when the total result is considered that so many who profess allegiance, their whole allegiance, to the provisions of the Constitution vote away the rights of the State, and ask the Federal Government to do something for them which they or the State should do. As the gentleman who just preceded me said, we heard a lot about pure water yesterday, especially from our Pennsylvania folks. When it was settled, the streams of Pennsylvania were some of the finest in the whole world—pure and cold water which we know is necessary to good health. How did the rivers get dirty and polluted? Only because the people who live along the banks of the river or use the river are themselves guilty of dirty practices. That seems to be a raw statement, but it is true; is it not? It is just the same as the case of our streets and our parks being dirty because the folks are careless and throw their waste out and walk or drive along or away and leave it there. Or the cause is the greed of industry which dumps its waste into a clean stream. In Michigan, in my hometown, we built our own sewers. We had to issue long-term bonds. But we did it and never have we cried about it. Allegan is a small town with a population of about 5,000. In Grand Rapids, a large city just 40 miles away, they voted a bond issue. They sold the bonds. They had the money. But along came this legislation by the Federal Government. What did they do? They had the money. They put in a disposal plant—and then took the Federal money—and they put their own money



back in their pockets. Legislation of this kind tends to make the people surrender their independence and become dependent upon the Federal Government. It makes weaklings of the people. As has been said so many, many times, Uncle Sam does not have a single dollar except as he gets it from the people. I see the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BAILEY] shaking his head from side to side. But what has just been said is true. What we are doing is to redistribute tax dollars. Taking from those who are paying in the most, giving a part to those States and those communities which pay in less or plead poverty. That is what we are doing here in almost every session. I cannot quite understand why, if we believe the States should retain their power and if we want independence in our local communities, we should not take care of our own sewerage problems, keep our own supply of water pure—if that is what we want, and apparently we do. Why should we not invoke the laws that are already on the books in every State against those who cause our rivers to be polluted?

The only possible answer I can see is that the communities think they do not have the money or are so limited in independence, in thrift, in willingness to earn their own money and spend it their own way—that they want someone else to carry them along—not willing to walk on their own feet.

Now I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Does the gentleman think that the residents of Radford, Va., and Harrisburg, Va., which are large communities and have big industries, have the right to pollute 120 miles of the New River?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Of course they have not, and there is a remedy for it, of course there is. There is nothing in the record to show they cannot clean up their own rivers. Surely they are not dependent upon, do not want other States to carry their burden. The people of the Virginias are a proud, independent people. I doubt they want the dollars of Michigan people to pay for the disposal of their waste and garbage.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close at 10 minutes past 1, the last 3 minutes to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the names of those gentlemen who are standing indicating they wish to speak on the amendment: Messrs. FOGARTY, BYRNES of Wisconsin, DENTON, GAVIN, BAILEY, HESTAND, and DURHAM.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not against the rules of the House for a Member to speak more than once on an amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman wishes to challenge any Member the

Chair will rule at the time the question is raised.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I was wondering if the Chair had any responsibility in the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule on any point of order at the time it is made.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, evidently the gentleman was referring to me. I do not want to cause him any concern. He has been very patient in listening to what I have had to say. My position on this matter is well known. I will withdraw my name if that will make the gentleman a little easier.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to transfer my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I think it would aid every Member of this House if he will get a copy of Public Law 660, the Water Pollution and Control Act. He will find that the general objectives and general operations of the Federal Government in the field of stream pollution are covered by that act.

This amendment does not repeal that law, it simply relates to but one section of it, section 6.

We have heard a lot of talk about the need to clean up our streams. With that objective I am in full agreement, but this amendment, Mr. Chairman, does not in and of itself clean up one single stream; there is no control aspect in this particular section 6 of the Water Pollution Act which is affected by this amendment.

From the speeches we have heard, one would think the Federal Government was not doing anything in the field of research, development, promotion, or control of pollution. The fact is, however, we are, if you will just read at the bottom of page 24 of the appropriation bill that is before us you will find that we are appropriating over \$12,500,000 for these particular purposes.

Mr. Chairman, the provision we are here discussing does not control pollution. Simply stated all it does is to get the Federal Government involved in a purely municipal function.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I am sorry, I have just 3 minutes. It does not say that any particular community will get money. Some Members feel that we have made a commitment. Read the public law. We make no commitment to any specific community. We do not say that every community that wants to build a sewer treatment plant or sewage disposal plant shall get money out of this bill. There are conditions and requirements. Even if a community can meet all those conditions and requirements there is no definite promise it will receive any part of this \$50 million. It is interesting to hear the gentleman from California contend that the munic-

ipalities are in need. I suppose no community has all the funds it would like, but if they are in need in connection with this matter I suppose they are in need so far as all other municipal facilities are concerned. What justification have we at this time to provide aid for this particular municipal function? If he is going to rest his case on the question of need, I think the gentleman better go and do a little studying on what the financial situation of the Federal Government is and compare that with the situation in the States and the municipalities. He will certainly find that from the standpoint of need, the greatest need is to reduce the expenditures of the Federal Government and provide some relief from Federal taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, the retention of this item in the pending appropriation bill is vital to my State of West Virginia where we have spent a tremendous amount of money in correcting pollution coming from the operation of mines. We have legislation preventing the building of any new industrial plants. We are forcing the plants that are there and that have been there for years to comply with our State laws requiring the installation of sewage treatment facilities.

The worst problem we have comes from the unrestricted flow of sewage from municipalities into streams that flow into the State of West Virginia. Let me ask: Why should West Virginia be imposed upon by the sister State of Virginia? They have sewage along the New River, they have cities, they have industrial plants that pollute over a hundred miles of the New River before it ever reaches the State of West Virginia.

You heard a gentleman say that we already have all the law that is necessary. I was in Congress when that river compact legislation was passed. I opposed it. Little has been accomplished toward taking care of the national pollution of our streams through that law. No better illustration need be given than reference to the Potomac River compact. You have seen the statements in the newspapers that they have not accomplished anything so far as that situation is concerned.

I sincerely hope that the pending amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM].

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the last few years we here in the United States have reached the point where water in some sections is one of the most critical items in supply. For the development of our industries, water is a must. We could never have developed our great industrial empire if this country had not inherited, so to speak, a great supply of pure water.

As the population has grown throughout our fast-developing country, the needs have shifted from one section to the other. In some sections there is a

lack of supply of water and in others there has been an oversupply. Also, we have built great hydroelectric dams for producing power, thus creating great wealth for the Nation. Federal funds have been expended rather freely in the Northwest and in the Tennessee Valley which have provided for those sections great economic growth and strength. On the east coast, from Maine to Florida, where the population is the densest and where the great industries of the country still remain to a large extent, and where the population has increased so rapidly, a great burden has been placed on our rivers and streams for the transportation of sewage and industrial waste out to the sea. The load has become almost unbearable, resulting in a great loss of pure water. This section must depend on these rivers flowing to the Atlantic for its supply of drinking water and for all other purposes where water is needed. The beaches from Maine to Florida are also being damaged.

All the States today have some body of law on the books against pollution of streams, and industry has been cooperating and trying to meet the required public health standards. But in my own particular section, of which I speak primarily, a small river flows through a highly industrialized section of three of my counties. Some of the communities there are one-mill village communities, several of them unincorporated. This stream supports or carries all the burden from the sewage plants for about 300,000 people or more. This is for a distance of only about 30 miles. The mill people are able to build and to provide equipment to take care of their own problem, but the village people cannot support the type of sewage disposal that is required by the public health standards unless they can secure help from some other source.

Further down this river, people are dependent on it for drinking water. This means not just one community affected, but miles and miles downstream people are deprived of the use of this water for drinking purposes. This is the only river of any size, with any supply of water, which flows throughout this section. It has become a critical situation for us, and I think the same thing applies to many other communities.

The Federal Government has authority over navigable streams. These little communities which have no authority to issue bonds are placed in a very bad position. I have enjoyed this stream as a boy and young man down through the years, but now it is almost impossible for a catfish to live in this river, which is known as Haw River. This is an Indian-name river, as the early settlers discovered who came in around 1720.

I have supported funds for water drought in the Southwest; I have supported funds for water supply for the California desert; and I voted to build dams out of Federal funds to control the Mississippi, the Ohio, and other rivers from flooding people out; and I believe at one time we went so far as to spend Federal funds to dig wells in the West. I can see that this is no different problem; it is just another problem of

the same type created by water and the necessary use of it by man.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, I hope that the Committee votes down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Hiestand].

Mr. Hiestand. Mr. Chairman, let us be clear in our minds just what this amendment does. All this amendment does is take out Government subsidies and grants for sewer installations and waste treatment works. That is all. It does not affect the purity of the water of our country. It does not even affect the curing of industrial wastes; not a bit. It just simply grants to the communities this money for waste treatment, for works construction.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Hiestand. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I just want to say that I heartily endorse what the gentleman has said, because this morning again on two different occasions I made a check, and there is nothing to this story, in which some believe, that it has anything to do with water pollution. Those funds are still available. Water pollution will have its fair share of consideration. They will be cooperating with the States, but this has nothing to do with water pollution, which many in this House feel it does.

Mr. Hiestand. I thank the gentleman. It is important to realize that we have a \$50 million possibility of saving funds. The grassroots is calling for savings. Here is a chance to do it. Many of you will be questioned, What did you do when it came to cutting the budget? Well, it may be truthfully said that some tried to cut, and probably you might claim some of the amendments were claimed to be penny wise and pound foolish, but here is a chance where you can tell your constituents you voted to make real savings.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment carries.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton].

Mr. Denton. Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope that this amendment is defeated. The House decided very clearly a year ago that they wanted this law put into effect. This amendment simply repeals the law that you passed last year.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Denton. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I merely want to say to my friend from Illinois, when he talks about it having nothing to do with pollution, do you mean to tell me when you build a sewage-disposal plant that it is not affecting pollution emptying into the streams? The pollution is now going into the rivers and streams. This legislation will encourage the people to build these sewage-disposal plants to eliminate the sewage being pumped into the streams. Certainly it has everything to do with stream pollution and clean waters. We have for years been polluting our streams. All this refuse and debris is going into the rivers, but when we build a sewage-

disposal plant it no longer goes into the rivers and it clears up waters. So do not say that this legislation has nothing to do with water pollution, because it does.

Mr. DENTON. I just want to say in conclusion that we have a bill offered by the gentleman from California that would provide Government assistance in preventing air pollution. Why cannot we have a bill aimed at water pollution of our streams?

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, that water is one of our most important natural resources, I have long maintained. I agree that maintaining quality is just as important as providing quantity. That we have a water-pollution problem stands uncontroverted.

The question is, Do we solve that problem by providing Federal aid at the rate of \$50 million per year for 10 years?

This appropriation cannot be justified on the basis of the inability of the local governments to finance the construction themselves. There is no showing that a single community cannot handle its own. Therefore, under the guiding principle that in what the States and local governments can do for themselves, the Federal Government ought not to interfere. This is not justified.

Recognizing this, the proponents argue that this is required to provide the incentive to cause the local governments to meet the problem. As I recall the debate last year, the committee contended that an immediate investment of \$7 billion was required to meet the present problem. Increased usage of water will almost double that figure in the next 10 years, the period of the authorization, as shown by the Hoover Commission figures on water usage and, as I recall, found by the legislative committee.

Our first year's experience, according to the committee hearings and this debate, indicates that the Federal Government under the formula supplies about 22 percent of the total cost. This would require a Federal contribution of \$1,400 million to provide the Federal share of the construction needed now and that much more to meet future requirements over the next 10 years. That would call for an annual appropriation of \$280 million per year for the next 10 years. This program and this appropriation calls for \$50 million per year. Such a program will aggravate the problem, not solve it. We are saying to municipalities, sewer districts, and the States, Wait for a Federal grant, rather than saying to them, This is an urgent problem, face it, do it now. Other features of the Water Pollution Act are well conceived and, given a chance, in my opinion, will help to really solve the problem. For these reasons I voted for the motion to recommend last year and for passage of the bill. For the same reasons I urge that this amendment be adopted.



The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, so many Members have just said what I was going to say. My very good friend, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], mentioned the fact that you and I or most of us voted for this legislation 1 year ago in June of last year by a majority of some 50 votes. This House passed the legislation that you are asking us to repeal now.

Now, some Members of Congress find fault with the Committee on Appropriations for bringing in legislation on appropriation bills. That is something that I cannot justify and I never have. But you who are supporting this amendment are doing exactly that thing today; you are doing it in reverse. You are offering an amendment to strike out this entire amount of \$50 million, and you are in effect repealing legislation that you voted for and that the President of the United States signed into law last July.

Someone said that the administration is not for this. Well, this item is in the budget. The budget that we have before us is the administration budget. It came from the White House. It has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. It must have had the approval of the President of the United States, or it would not be before us at this time. And, when my friend from California makes the statement, and the gentleman from Illinois who is on his feet now states that the construction of these plants has nothing to do with the cleaning up of the polluted waters of this country, they are just as wrong as wrong can be. The principal thing that this program does is to stimulate the communities in building these sewage-disposal plants. As a result, when these sewage-disposal plants are in operation, it makes the streams clearer; it cleans up the waters. And beyond that there is the benefit that goes to the communities downstream even more than it does to the communities which are building these particular sewage plants.

Now, another statement was made about redtape here yesterday by the author of this amendment. This law was not passed until July 9 of last year. We have had only 9 months of operation up to this time. Nine hundred and ten applications have been received from every State in the Union and from each of the congressional districts that you and I represent. Two hundred and eighty-eight of those applications have already been processed. Twenty-five million dollars has been approved. And if we approve all the 910 applications it will mean \$88 million, which is \$38 million more than we have authorized under this law. If we vote for this amendment we will be making one of the saddest mistakes we have made on this appropriation bill because this is something that is going to help every individual in our country.

Those who appeared before our committee in support of this appropriation were representatives of the Isaak Walton League, the Federation of Sewage and

Industrial Waste Associations, the National Wildlife Federation, the Wildlife Management Institute, and so forth. Every one of these organizations is 100 percent behind this bill. I think it should be enacted into law and not repealed as this amendment will do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FISHER and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 162, noes 140.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise, report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken, and that the bill be re-committed to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions that it be reported back to the House within 5 days with amendments which will indicate the places and amounts in the budget where the committee believes, in view of the statements made in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, that substantial reductions may best be made and will meet the views of the House with the least curtailment of efficient administration by the Departments affected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the interest of saving time, I am perfectly willing that the point of order should be ruled on now. Why wait 5 minutes or 10 minutes if it is out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island care to be heard on the point of order? The Chair is ready to rule.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, as I remember the reading of the motion, there is matter of wording contained therein that is not permissible under the rules governing procedure in Committee of the Whole, but would be allowed under the rules of procedure in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire to be heard?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I want to point out that there is a precedent for the motion and the rules cite a precedent where that motion has been held to be proper in the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not familiar with that precedent, but the rules of the House provide that certain language contained in the motion made by the gentleman from Michigan could be entertained in Committee of the Whole, but the balance of the motion would only be appropriate in the House. For that reason, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the motion that was offered is based upon a precedent found in Cannon's Procedures, page 103, note 6, and Hind's Precedents, page 117, section 2329, where Mr. Currier, chairman, said:

The gentleman may move that the Committee rise and report this bill to the House with the recommendation that it be re-committed to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. A motion to recommit is in order in the House. It is in order in Committee of the Whole House to move that when the Committee rises it recommends to the House a recommitment of the bill.

However, as a safeguard this second motion to rise and report the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken is now offered. If the motion to strike the enacting clause is adopted by the Committee, the Committee will go back into the House and the same motion which the Chair has just ruled out of order in Committee will be in order in the House but it cannot there be offered until the disposal of any rollcall that has been demanded on any amendment has been had. One of the President's first and most enthusiastic supporters under date of March 31 printed an editorial in the Detroit, Mich., Free Press, the Chicago Daily News, and the Miami, Fla., and Akron, Ohio, papers and there wrote:

I had hoped this week to get off the President's back. There is no satisfaction in disagreeing with a man for whom you have tremendous respect and affection.

But when Ike derided attempts to cut his overstuffed budget as fatuous and foolish economy, it seemed that a few more words should be said on the subject.

Mr. Chairman, the editorial will later be read. But this is the point. This is the seventh day of debate on this bill. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] announced there would be rollcalls on at least eight amendments.

Mr. FOGARTY. There will be a rollcall on one more amendment now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That makes nine. Now, how many more rollcalls will be asked by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] I do not know. It is very evident from the way the debate has gone on in Committee that we will be here at least another day on the rollcall votes.

Here we are now with the budget that the President sent up to us, cut by the Committee on Appropriations and then by this committee. After the budget was sent to us it is my understanding the President said that cuts could be made; that if desirable we should make them. Then the House, in its wisdom, or lack of it, sent that budget back to the President with suggestions that he tell us where the cuts could be made with the least harm.

The President very properly sent it back to us saying it was our business to make cuts where we thought they should be made.

The committee has made its suggestions as to where and in what amounts the reductions should be made.

The gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. FOGARTY], throughout the debate—perhaps it may be said every day on every amendment—has charged that we are just walking up the hill only to walk down again. It was also said that by making certain reductions we were endangering the health and lives of our people. An appeal to passion and prejudice.

This motion to recommit which will be offered in the House if adopted does this: Instead of sending the bill back to the President we send it back to the Committee on Appropriations for reconsideration, which is just exactly what the majority did when it was sent back to the President. Why should not the committee take another look, come back with what the committee, having in mind the desire of the Members, has to suggest—not just the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY]—oh, no, not his suggestions alone, but those of the full committee meeting again and having in mind the fact that practically everyone, including the President, by inference at least, says the budget should be cut.

Why not come back with what might be termed a clean bill, perhaps the result of compromise, certainly the result of more adequate, careful, comprehensive consideration. Then perhaps we could agree on what should be done in the interests of economy which is what the people want—what we say we want.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Just to pinpoint what the gentleman has said in view of the fact so many Members have suggested that the President should tell us where cuts in the budget should be made I want to call attention to the statement the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] put in the RECORD yesterday coming from Secretary Folsom:

Some of these programs, of course, were enacted last year without our specific recommendations and some of them went in over our objections. For example, on the water-pollution waste-treatment projects, we did not recommend an appropriation authorization to Congress and that is a \$50 million item.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman but I cannot yield further. The only purpose of asking that the bill be sent back to the committee is that we may have a better bill, a bill on which those who advocate economy can reach agreement; make the more sensible cuts do the least harm to each phase of the program.

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK—IKE FORSAKES CONVICTIONS FOR THE PERILOUSLY UNSOUND  
(By John S. Knight)

I had hoped this week to get off the President's back. There's no satisfaction in disagreeing with a man for whom you have tremendous respect and affection, particularly if he happens to be the President of the United States.

Better to tell how the incredible Dave Beck lived it up with union funds, or discuss Bold Ruler's chances against Calumet's triple entry in the Kentucky Derby.

But when Ike derided attempts to cut his overstuffed budget as fatuous and foolish economy, it seemed that a few more words should be said on the subject.

The President made three points at last Wednesday's press conference:

1. Piecemeal cuts of \$25 million here, \$50 million there and \$150 million anywhere are "meaningless . . . just kidding yourselves."

2. That "significant cuts" could come only from security items such as defense and foreign aid.

3. That Congress, while talking about economy had voted "a great number of public works . . . without proper engineering studies to back them up," so the action "must be for political purposes."

In the first place, I was surprised and disappointed to have the President speak of budget cuts ranging from \$25 million to \$150 million as foolish, piecemeal economy.

And to brand such efforts by Congress as imbecilic.

This is the same President Eisenhower who vowed four years ago to exercise a prudent control over Government expenses.

When the Chief Executive now shows no interest in eliminating items that run into hundreds of millions, we should all be worried.

#### WHAT ABOUT WASTE IN THE MILITARY?

The President's second point is that cuts in defense and foreign economic assistance can be made only at a risk to our security.

Here again, many informed people will disagree.

Our defenses must not be reduced, but there is a lot of waste in the Military Establishment as everybody knows.

And why should foreign aid be stepped up an additional \$500 million?

When the Marshall plan began, President Truman said: "I guarantee to you that we'll not spend it for more than 4 years—15 billions of dollars."

HARRY F. BYRD, the consistent Senator from Virginia, says his investigation of foreign aid in Europe disclosed that we have given Denmark \$100 million to pay on their public debt.

So we just added that much to our national debt.

Great Britain was presented with \$200 million to reduce taxes.

Ours didn't go down.

#### PUBLIC'S LOUD CRY REACHES CONGRESS

The President is right when he maintains that Congress plays politics with public money.

But Congress is hearing from the people, and if the people make enough noise, Congress pays attention.

That was shown Wednesday when the House of Representatives made a \$442 million piecemeal reduction in the \$2.8 billion appropriation the administration had asked for the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Eisenhower administration is insisting that the Government must provide aid to the States in the field of education.

In demanding this aid, it is disregarding its own Kestnbaum Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which reported that: "We have not been able to find a State which cannot afford to make more money available to its schools or is unable to support an adequate school program."

The educators quite naturally will welcome this help. It will give them the buildings, schoolrooms, auditoriums, and gymnasiums they think they need.

As Raymond Moley says: "Asking a professional educator if he needs a new building is like asking Johnny if he wants a new bicycle."

Certainly, many of these things are desirable, but are they absolutely essential when the Federal debt is at its statutory limit?

#### EISENHOWER SCRAPS CAUTION ON GRANTS

The new budget contains 14 new Federal grants-to-States programs, bringing the total to 67.

The President used to say that the Federal Government should not do those things for the States which they are able to do for themselves.

This sound doctrine, like the prudent expenditure of the people's money, has long since been scrapped.

Here is an example, taken from Senator BYRD's recent address to the Senate:

There is in the budget an item entitled: "Salaries and expenses, President's Committee on Education Beyond High School, Department of Health, Education and Welfare." It is shown as an "old" program.

The committee was given a 1957 appropriation of \$150,000 to make a report by December 31, 1957. The original appropriation provided no funds for grants or subsidies.

The pending budget proposes an additional 1957 supplemental sum of \$650,000 in the current year for grants and subsidies. Then it goes further and proposes one 1958 appropriation of \$300,000 to enable the committee to complete its report, and another \$2,500,000 "further to assist in developing programs . . . to implement recommendations of the committee."

Here we have, says Senator BYRD, a \$150,000 appropriation for a committee report, which in two years, grows to a \$3 million appropriation for a grants-and-subsidy program—before the report is made.

This is a small example of how these programs grow.

#### FIND BUDGET FILLED WITH BOONDOGGLES

Edwin A. Lahey and David Kraslow of our Washington bureau read the 1,249 pages of the new budget submitted by the administration.

They found it to be loaded with frills and boondoggles. Is this good government?

We have 2,389,792 Federal employees. The new budget proposes to add 40,000 more.

In addition, we have 273,674 civilian employees in foreign countries, 26,000 in France, 98,000 in Germany, and 129,000 in Japan.

There are 37,817,000 citizens receiving direct checks from the Federal Government every month. Including their dependents, claims Senator BYRD, it is possible that the majority of the population get checks from Washington.

And the number will rise under the Eisenhower philosophy that "these are the services which people demand, and in my opinion deserve."

#### IKE'S PRESENT DEAL TO TOP THEM ALL

The Senator from Virginia, says that he has survived the New Deal, the Fair Deal and the Present Deal. He says with regret that the Present Deal will land somewhere midway between the New Deal and the Fair Deal.

I would respectfully disagree with that conclusion.

In my opinion, the Present Deal will go far beyond anything ever contemplated by Presidents Roosevelt and Truman.

This is not what the majority of the American people voted for in the elections of 1952 and 1956.

Prior to Franklin D. Roosevelt, our Government followed a pay-as-you-go philosophy. Andrew Jackson, one of the patron saints of the Democratic Party, boasted that he had paid off the public debt in full.

We practiced frugality and thrift in the first 150 years of our Republic, laying the foundations for our future prosperity.

Today, we are endangering the fiscal integrity of our country by reckless spending both at home and abroad.

It is tragic indeed that a man like Eisenhower, a self-proclaimed economic conservative, has forsaken his earlier convictions for



a philosophy of government that is unsound and fraught with peril.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The above editorial comes from the pen of John S. Knight, the publisher of several dailies and one of the President's first and most ardent supporters. In fact, Mr. Knight, on several occasions, was editorially quite impatient with conservatives and Taft supporters who did not fall down and worship at Ike's feet.

If memory serves, Mr. Knight was something of an internationalist, a staunch advocate of foreign aid, and through his newspapers, which had and have a wide circulation in several of our States, did much in support of Ike and his views.

It would seem to be unfortunate that some who so enthusiastically urged Ike to become a candidate, did so much toward his election, should now be short on patience with a President who has had so little experience with our civilian activities and who has been recently so seriously ill.

Ike has been reported to have said some pretty harsh things about conservative Republicans in praise of "Modern Republicanism." It is more than probable that some of his personal friends and advisers, like Paul Hoffman and Stassen, may have whispered too much nonsense into his ear.

Ike is not the first President who has lost support because of listening to his personal friends and advisers.

While voting my own convictions on legislation which comes up with the apparent endorsement of the President, I, for one, intend to show a little degree of consideration for his views and wherever possible support him. He does not deserve the petty criticism which has been tossed at him.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand why the gentleman from Michigan is getting so concerned over these rollcall votes that are coming up. I thought that he would be happy to stand up and be counted when the roll was called. If you want to avoid it, one way is to adopt the motion the gentleman has just offered.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Was the gentleman asking me if I would stand up and be counted?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not say that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What did you say?

Mr. FOGARTY. I said that if you were interested in standing up and being counted when these rollcalls are asked for you would not have offered such a motion as you just offered.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not believe that, does he?

Mr. FOGARTY. Oh, you are just avoiding the issue.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You think I am ducking and running out? I am just giving the gentleman a chance, and you have them on your side. I am just giving them a chance to send this bill back to committee, having the committee make reductions in the light of what has

happened that will not hurt the bill. We do not want to hurt anyone.

Mr. FOGARTY. But the motion that you have just made is in effect ducking the votes if this committee adopts your method.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Ducking nothing.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is all there is to it. If not, when we get back into the House why does not the gentleman offer a motion to recommit with certain instructions as to where he thinks the committee ought to make specific changes and report the bill back? There might be some logic to that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the gentleman will yield, I would be glad to do that if I were so conceited as to think I had the wisdom and enlightenment to cut wisely. I just cannot. I am trusting the gentleman's committee to come in and do the best it can. As to the nine amendments the gentleman wants a roll on, I am willing personally to vote on every one of them, but I thought perhaps after consideration again having in mind the votes in the House that we could make some headway by this method.

Mr. FOGARTY. The best way I know of doing it is to give the gentleman and the other Members a chance to answer these rollcalls.

Now, as far as giving this bill some consideration is concerned, may I say that we have really worked hard and long on this particular appropriation bill. The committee worked for about 6 or 7 weeks on it. We went into our hearings at 10 o'clock in the morning until 12:30 every day and then from 1:30 until nearly 5 o'clock. This in addition to our regular congressional activities. That is a long day. We listened to 180 witnesses and we took nearly 2,000 pages of testimony. I would like to point out that there was not one word of evidence in all our exhaustive committee hearings that you have before you today that will justify any cut you have voted for up to this time. On the last amendment you just voted for, we had the advice of four civic organizations representing millions of people in our country who are interested in clean water systems all over the country. They took the time to come from all sections of the country to appeal to this committee to give and to allow the amount authorized by the President of the United States. That is exactly what we have done.

After we completed our hearings, we then went through the requests, item by item, and cut where we thought we could intelligently cut. I think we did a pretty good job because this bill deals with human beings, with the bodies and minds of people now living or who are yet unborn in this country. If you honestly believe in a bill that affects the lives of American citizens, their life expectancy, and the life expectancy of those who are not yet born, a bill that makes this country a better place to live in and a healthier place to live in, then I cannot understand how you can support the efforts being made to cut it as it has been cut. I just cannot understand the logic behind the amendments that you have offered so far in this bill.

I would like to refer to some rather outstanding people in our Nation and to their opinions on this portion of President Eisenhower's budget that we have been discussing for over a week and which most of the Members on the gentleman's side want to reduce still further than the committee has already reduced it. First, many of you will remember the press release issued by the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare on February 14, regarding the 1958 budget. To refresh everyone's mind I will place that press release in the RECORD. It is as follows:

STATEMENT BY MARION B. FOLSOM, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The President's budget for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare represents a sound, constructive, and prudent approach to problems in this field.

It is not too large in itself, in the light of national needs in these areas. Nor is it too large in proportion to the size of the total budget, or the national ability to support these programs.

Expenditures recommended by the President for this Department in fiscal 1958 amount to \$2.8 billion, or about 4 percent of the budget total.

These proposed programs are investments in human resources—in the health of the American people, in their education and training for living in an increasingly complex world, in their protection against economic want. These are the resources upon which, ultimately, our continuing prosperity and our national security depend.

Neglect of health, education, or economic security will prove very costly in the long run. For problems in these fields, unless resolved, will be compounded by the passage of time. Related problems develop, and the ultimate cost of solutions becomes far greater.

It is important to bear in mind that 64 percent of the Department's budget, or \$1.8 billion, would be required for public assistance grants to the needy, aged, blind, disabled, and dependent children.

We are most anxious to develop constructive programs which will reduce human need in the future. Such programs have received increased emphasis in the 1958 budget.

Most of the recommended increase for the Department would go to help eliminate a critical shortage of classrooms in financially needy communities across the country. I know of no better investment the country could make than to remove a serious deficiency in facilities for education which, if permitted to continue, could only serve to retard our national progress.

The other increases are relatively small in terms of dollars but I believe they will yield important long-range benefits.

Increases of \$7.3 million for vocational rehabilitation, for example, will help restore more handicapped persons to productive employment and will return, in both humanitarian and economic rewards, far more than the cost. A requested investment of \$2.1 million for research in the causes of dependency, and ways of overcoming them, should help reduce the human and economic toll of dependency in our society. Similarly, we are proposing \$2.5 million to assist in training more professional workers to help solve the complex human problems involved in dependency. We are asking for an increase of \$1.3 million for research to help solve long-standing problems which have handicapped education for many years.

The proposed record level of medical research expenditures offers bright promise for reducing the tragic toll of disease and disability among the American people. The proposed aid in building medical teaching

facilities and other increases for health programs are also important in accomplishing this objective. We are requesting \$3 million to help States and communities attack the growing problem of juvenile delinquency. A proposed increase of \$2.5 million will help assure safety to consumers in the use of foods and drugs which are rapidly increasing in both volume and complexity.

These are sound, practical investments which, over many years ahead, will yield far more than their cost in preventing human need, fostering economic growth, and strengthening national security.

The administration is proposing these advances in health, education, and economic security within the framework of a balanced overall budget. The budget, in fact, provides for a surplus for the third successive year. This is no small achievement at a time when circumstances beyond our control compel very large defense expenditures.

If we are to be realistic in our approach, we should consider expenditures for health, education, and welfare and for certain other programs not only in terms of total dollar amounts but also in relation to our population and our whole economy. It is only natural that some budget figures should tend to increase as the population grows rapidly and the economy expands to record peaks.

By 1958, it is estimated the national income will have increased 57 percent over 1950. The recommended 1958 nondefense Federal expenditures<sup>1</sup> amount to an increase of only 14 percent over 1950. The recommended level of nondefense spending would be 4.3 percent of the estimated national income, approximately the same proportion as for the previous 2 years. This is down substantially from the ratio of 7.2 percent in 1940 and 5.9 percent in 1950. Thus, in relation to our means, the 1958 budget for non-defense needs is less than it has been in the past.

The proposed total Federal spending for 1958 would be 19 percent of estimated national income, compared with 22.7 percent in 1954, the first full fiscal year of this administration.

The administration's continuing goal with respect to the budget is clear. It is to restrain Federal spending and cut taxes when this can be done consistent with the national interest. The President and his budget advisers, I know, were guided by a deep sense of fiscal prudence in carefully developing the 1958 budget recommendations in the light of our needs for national protection and for continuing progress in domestic affairs.

Then I would like to read some excerpts from an article entitled "Trends in State Government—1957 as Indicated by the Governor's Message" in the March 1957 issue of *State Government* the official publication of the Council of State Governments. This article states:

Dealing with States services, the governors called for expansion and advance, above all, in education, in highway construction, and in highway safety. But emphasis was strong in other areas as well—mental health, problems of the aging, and management of natural resources prominent among them.

\*\*\* But behind most of the governors' proposals lay such realities as rapid growth of the population; the relative increase of the younger and older segments of the population; the soaring enrollments in schools; the shortages of trained teachers and school buildings; the record traffic on an inadequate highway network; and the Federal program, with its State matching provisions, for bringing the network up to date.

<sup>1</sup>Nondefense expenditures include all functions except those listed in the budget as "major national security," "veterans services and benefits," and "interest."

\*\*\* As one of the governors summarized, most of the problems that confront this State are "products of our growing population and our expanding economy."

\*\*\* "If grass were growing in our streets," he said, "and if smoke were not pouring from the stacks of our factories, we would not have to face \*\*\* the problems of progress."

So you can see our Governors seem to be concerned about keeping up with our growing population, expanding economy, and problems in the fields dealt with in this bill, and certainly do not appear to want us to start going backward.

There have also been many, many comments in very respectable newspapers that I could include in the *RECORD* to support my contention that those who seek to cut the bill still further, or seek to recommit it to the committee for further cuts, do not represent the feeling of many highly respected Americans and, in my opinion, the majority of the American people. I shall not burden the *RECORD* with all of those newspaper articles that have come to my attention but I will include three of them in the *RECORD*, the first two from the *New York Times* of March 29 and April 3 and the third from the *Washington Post* of April 3. These articles are as follows:

[From the *New York Times* of March 29, 1957]

#### IN THE NATION—SWIM, BUT DON'T GO NEAR THE WATER

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, March 28.—It is the "poorest kind of economy," said the President, defending his \$72 billion budget yesterday, "to say you [Congress] are going to save a few millions here and a few millions there." Maybe so, replied Representative TABER, of New York, "but when you don't have any other kind of economizing available, you have to take what you can get."

This was a pretty good riposte in the circumstances because, in further comment on the budget, the President stoutly opposed large reductions on the basis of an orderly formula. This, he said, would cripple continuing programs for which Congress itself had made the Government responsible, and the new programs (schoolroom construction, for example) which he had proposed because he considered them essential to the popular need and the duty of the Federal Government to provide.

By that statement the President took direct issue with Senator BYRD, of Virginia, as well as Representative TABER among the congressional leaders who differ with him about the potentialities of cutting the budget. BYRD contends that an orderly economizing formula is also available to Congress and can be followed without damage to the popular need or the national security. The difference between the President's attitude and the Virginia Senator's has been expressed by the latter in several statements on and off the Senate floor.

#### "INDEFENSIBLE INCREASES"

"Proposals [by the President] establishing new functions, expanding old ones, and for indefensible increases in current authorizations," BYRD told the Senate, "requested in the Federal budget for fiscal 1958 \*\*\* will force continuing increases in future budgets." And he specified:

"I am convinced that requested appropriations can be reduced by \$6.5 billion: national security, \$1.5 billion; foreign aid and international affairs, \$2 billion; domestic-civilian activities, \$3 billion \*\*\* reducing the budget to \$66.8 billion."

Of the continuing and new programs for civilian-domestic activities, which the President yesterday classified as either imposed by Congress or by the popular need, the Senator said:

"These appropriations are up 36 percent since 1954. The budget contains 37 proposals for new and expanded activities, with 1958 requests totaling \$2 billion. These include 14 new Federal grants to State programs, bringing the total to 67, and among these is the Federal school construction program with a first year appropriation of \$451 million. Among the hundreds of old current accounts the budget proposes increases in 3 out of every 4. \*\*\* Yet the domestic-civilian programs, even after the cut [of \$3 billion urged by BYRD], exclusive of high ways, will have \$23.8 billion in new authorizations, plus \$24 billion in unexpended balances in prior appropriations, for a total of nearly \$48 billion."

The Eisenhower budget for fiscal 1958, the Senator said to his colleagues, "is a complete reversal of the retrenchment policy to which this administration pledged itself." After reducing the last Truman budget by \$10 billion and cutting spending another \$3 billion for fiscal 1955, the President's budgets "have been rising steadily, with huge increases in the domestic-civilian area. This is the worst yet. It begins another spending spree which will continue inflation and raise the cost of living. And let us not forget that the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury \*\*\* denounced this budget presented by his own administration as authorizing expenditures which, if continued, would lead to a depression that would 'curl your hair.'"

#### HUMPHREY'S PLIGHT

That reference was to the unhappy situation of a man in the middle, George M. Humphrey, who obviously would like to take a public stand much closer to BYRD's position. But to do that, especially after what the President said yesterday, Humphrey would be in open conflict with his chief, to whom he is intensely loyal. And since Humphrey has made plain his belief that in the national interest the President's leadership should be maintained at its highest possible degree, the Secretary's resignation—which this open conflict would impose on a man of such high principle—would undoubtedly be a heavy blow to that leadership.

Another point of difference between the President and BYRD is that the Senator does not agree that the budget and its expanded social-economic programs are responsive to public opinion. The total tax collections by all forms of American Government is now \$110 billion annually out of an annual income of \$325 billion. And the growing public protest against the ever-rising Federal budget has much of its source in the level of taxation, as Congress is acutely aware.

The President's remarks yesterday complete the anomaly of his position and deepen Humphrey's plight. Both urged Congress to cut the budget. Yet the President now contends it cannot be done either substantially or piecemeal.

[From the *New York Times* of April 3, 1957]

#### BUDGET CUTS QUESTIONED—DECLINE IN WELFARE OUTLAYS NOTED, WITH BURDEN ON LOCALITIES

TO THE EDITOR OF THE *NEW YORK TIMES*:

Is the budget too large? First, let me admit that on the basis of the experience of the last few years actual expenditures will exceed budgeted ones (estimates of January 1957 for fiscal year 1958) by a few billion dollars. Second, let me agree also that the budget is not in as sound shape as the administration suggests.

For example, in 2 years roadbuilding in the budget is cut from \$783 million to \$43 million. But \$1.7 billion of outlays has now



been taken out of the budget and tucked away in a trust fund. But even with all that I am not worried about the size of the budget.

First, the size of the budget should be put against the size of the economy. In the last 4 years the budget has fallen from 20 percent of the gross national product (GNP) to 16 percent of the GNP, or a relative decline of 20 percent. In the last 10 years the size of the national debt has declined by about one-half in relation to the GNP.

Second, the more germane criticism is that the Eisenhower administration has gone in too much for economy and not enough for needed Government services.

#### VIEWED AGAINST ECONOMY

Welfare outlays have dropped in a period (1952 to 1956) when gross national product rose by \$65 billion and military outlays were cut by \$10 billion or more and reductions of taxes, costing about \$9 billion a year today, were made.

Even as our peril grew and our international position deteriorated, the Eisenhower administration increased the danger to our trillion-dollar economy and our security generally by serious cuts in our military budget and by a reduction of foreign economic aid of one-half as compared with the last Truman administration and two-thirds vis-a-vis the GNP. Some estimates of cuts are much higher. At least there is now a disposition to reconsider the economy program for national security. For this we are grateful.

The budget upsets Secretary Humphrey especially because of promises made but not kept. The rise of \$3 billion (\$4.7 billion on a cash basis) in 1 year haunts the administration because, with the cash budget up by \$23 billion above the 1952 Taft-Eisenhower commitment, they are embarrassed. They even had asked for cuts in the 1952 campaign of \$40 billion, \$25 billion, and \$10 billion.

But let us note even the \$72-billion 1958 budget is more than 20 percent less in relation to GNP than the 1953 Truman budget, which was under examination in the 1952 campaign. I say this is too great a cut, considering our peril, our shortage of several hundred thousand schoolrooms, our slums, the inadequacies of our social-security program, the unavailability of comprehensive health insurance, etc.

In the welfare area housing costs in the new budget are down and outlays on labor and welfare (health, education, and public assistance especially) up by \$506 million.

#### WELFARE PROGRAMS

Surely this is no New Deal program when allowance is made for the slashes in 1952-56 and the rise of prices and income. At the very most, the rise in welfare programs in the budget cost about 5 percent of the average annual rise of GNP expected over the next 10 years. Is this excessive, especially in view of the history of 1952-56?

Those who are vexed by the size of the Federal budget would have much more reason to be concerned over the trends of State and local finance. The Federal Government tends to pass its responsibilities on to these governments. For example, new construction by the Federal Government declined from \$4.8 billion in 1952 to \$3.6 billion in 1956, or a drop of 25 percent; and by State and local rose from \$6.1 billion to \$9.8 billion, or a rise of more than 60 percent. Hence, the latter became twice as important relative to Federal outlays in 4 years.

Total expenditures of State and local governments are up from \$12 billion in 1946 to \$28 billion in 1952 and \$40 billion in 1956. On trends of recent years, State and local governments will be spending \$60 billion in 10 years. Is it fair for the Federal Government to tap the richest sources of revenues and put increased responsibilities on State and local governments?

In short, the size of the budget is not so serious as it seems to many, even if allowance is made for peculiar accounting. The administration is to be criticized rather for promises not kept, for dubious accounting, for unwarranted slashes of security and welfare outlays, and for putting excessive burdens on State and local governments.

SEYMOUR E. HARRIS.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., March 29, 1957.

[From the Washington Post of April 3, 1957]

#### IKE DEFENDS BUDGET, ASKS BUSINESSMEN TO ALERT PUBLIC TO FEDERAL AID NEEDS

President Eisenhower threw his full weight behind his \$71.8 billion Federal budget again yesterday.

He challenged 300 business leaders to educate Americans to the need for Federal aid to domestic, school, welfare, and health programs.

In the foreign field, the President said the overriding objective to achieve peace is far more important than a tax cut.

"Much as we hate taxes, it (world peace) is an objective that overrides our aversion to high taxes," he told the 13th Washington conference of the Advertising Council, a non-profit organization which marshals the forces of advertising for public-service campaigns.

The President's remarks were in line with his press conference promise last week to defend his spending requests against current attacks in Congress.

He spoke as the House debated cuts in his health, education, and welfare money bill, the fifth to reach the floor. So far, economy-minded Congressmen have lopped \$800 million from Eisenhower requests of \$13.8 billion.

"I am struck so often by the simplest functions of government that are misunderstood," the President said. "For example, the school program. \* \* \*

"We have a situation today throughout the country of schools running two sessions a day, with teachers overburdened—often teachers having to be employed who are not really qualified. The school situation is suffering very, very badly for lack of facilities."

He stressed Federal aid was essential to inspire the States to improve education, absolutely necessary to the continuation of vital democracy.

"The Federal Government might well help on a one-time basis to get these schools built, to catch up and get out," Mr. Eisenhower said.

The Chief Executive acknowledged that "many people have thought the Federal Government should not take any part in the welfare funds in our country—old age security, unemployment insurance, and health processes."

But to the President such Federal help equalizes services in the several States.

"We would have migrations in this country, with dislocations in industry and in labor force, merely because in one State people would say we can get better help when misfortune, old age, or something of that kind strikes by moving to such a State," he warned.

Afterwards, conferees heard news commentators Roscoe Drummond, Marquis Childs, Edward R. Murrow, and James B. Reston on a panel presided over by Philip L. Graham, publisher of the Washington Post, at a Mayflower Hotel luncheon.

Drummond said the character of the Republican Presidential ticket in the next election hinged on the outcome of the fight over the President's budget.

Cutting it is the touchstone of the faith of right-wing Republicans, Drummond commented, and preserving the budget, the hope of Eisenhower Republicans.

Childs characterized efforts to unify Europe as enormously hopeful despite three handicaps: Foot-dragging in England, a strong sentiment to go it alone in the Rhineland, and an insistence of France to bring North African colonies into the alliance.

Reston sketched problems of leaders today in rearing their training and thinking to meet new enormous, even terrifying responsibilities of this age.

Murrow warned against overestimating the reasonableness of Israelites and underestimating Egypt's Nasser, "the calmest, coolest, gambling man I have ever met."

In addition to all this top-level opinion I have received hundreds of letters, telegrams, telephone calls, and personal visits from the people at the ground level who are meeting these problems every day and who, in my opinion, are in the best position to know what these proposed cuts really mean to the American people. It is hard for me to keep from really burdening the Record in this instance because I would like all Members to see what has been pouring in to me from these folks. However, I will include just three telegrams that I especially wish to call attention to. These are as follows:

PROVIDENCE, R. I., March 28, 1957.

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY,  
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

To help meet critical nurse shortage and insure adequate health care for our people additional graduate nurses must be prepared for teaching and administrative positions which essential and expanding health programs demand. Because of your own and our deep concern and responsibility in this vital situation members of the Rhode Island State Nurses Association urge your support for increased appropriations for public health and graduate-nurse traineeships and extension of practical nurse programs provided for by Public Law 911.

MARTHA O. SAYLES,  
President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 27, 1957.

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY,  
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

The Disabled American Veterans is greatly concerned regarding proposal in House of Representatives to reduce appropriations recommended by your committee for the Veterans' Employment Service of the Department of Labor. Further reduction will seriously impair the service, in placement of disabled veterans into employment. Respectfully urge you to strongly support your recommendation.

OMER W. CLARK,  
Director of Legislation, Disabled  
American Veterans.

WASHINGTON, D. C., March 28, 1957.

HON. JOHN E. FOGARTY,  
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Veterans of Foreign Wars disturbed over tentative House reductions in appropriations for Veterans' Employment Service, Bureau of Veterans Reemployment Rights and Bureau of Employment Security. Strongly urge your support of the amount recommended by Appropriations Committee for these three agencies. Efforts should be made to bring these appropriation items up for rollcall vote to maintain recommendations made by Appropriations Committee.

OMAR B. KETCHUM,  
VFW National Legislative Director.

I hope the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants for hospital construction: For payments under parts C and G, title VI, of the act, as amended, \$121,200,000, of which \$99,000,000 shall be for payments for hospitals and related facilities pursuant to part C, \$1,200,000 shall be for the purposes authorized in section 636 of the act, and \$21,000,000 shall be for payments for facilities pursuant to part G, as follows: \$6,500,000 for diagnostic or treatment centers, \$6,500,000 for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, \$4,000,000 for rehabilitation facilities, and \$4,000,000 for nursing homes: *Provided*, That allotments under such parts C and G to the several States for the current fiscal year shall be made on the basis of amounts equal to the limitations specified herein.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HÉBERT: Page 25, line 6, after "as amended", strike out "\$121,200,000" and insert "\$100,000,000"; line 7, after "which", strike out "\$99,000,000" and insert "\$77,800,000"; line 20, after the words "as amended", strike out "\$1,450,000" and substitute "\$1,381,000."

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the remarks that have been made on the floor during the last 7 days of debate and the arguments advanced against the cutting of these sums and amounts, I am now able to offer an amendment which meets the objections of both sides and I am sure can well be supported because it does not destroy any program; it does not reduce any salaries; it does not reduce or increase any personnel.

As a matter of fact, it will be noted in this amendment that I do not touch at all the \$6,500,000 for diagnostic or treatment centers, \$6,500,000 for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, \$4 million for rehabilitation facilities, and \$4 million for nursing homes.

What I do propose is to reduce at the top of the heap some \$21 million for hospital construction, popularly known as the Hill-Burton Act. There is no finer program in existence than the Hill-Burton program. It is a magnificent program; it is one that should be continued and a program which should be given all the money it can use. But the testimony of the budget officer of the Department indicates that in 1956 the fiscal year was ended with an unobligated balance of \$79 million.

In 1957 the unobligated balance was some \$91 million and it is estimated by that same budget officer in testimony before the committee on page 587, in answer to a question by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LARD], that the anticipated unobligated funds at the end of fiscal 1958 will be \$86 million.

Now, I do not think it takes an intellectual giant but just a common, ordinary garden variety individual like myself to ask the question, and properly so, What does an agency want to ask \$121 million for when it admits that at the end of fiscal 1958, for which it is asking this sum, there will be an unobligated amount of some \$86 million? I think I

have been very generous in only striking some 20 percent and then allowing everything else in the program to remain, of course, with the exception of the expansion of the administration of the program at the top, which would not be needed if they had that much less money. I see no objection to it, and I hope that the House in its wisdom will understand that this is merely a demonstration of drawing in the belt, as I suggested in my opening remarks the other day, of tightening up a little bit and not harming this program one iota.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I wonder if the gentleman knows whether, in computing the number of hospitals to be built under the Hill-Burton Act, any consideration has been given to the staffing of those hospitals. What relationship does the building program have to the shortage of personnel?

Mr. HÉBERT. I have found no indication of what the shortage of personnel has to do with the construction of the hospital itself. I am talking about the stone and the mortar.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes; but if we have stone and mortar, we want to put the patients in the hospitals and have them cared for.

Mr. HÉBERT. I suggest to the gentle lady that I am allowing the sum to remain for the nursing homes, and next year, after they are graduated and trained, they may be sufficiently trained to increase that amount.

Mrs. BOLTON. But, there is no relationship established between the plans for building and the plans for more nurses.

Mr. HÉBERT. There is no relationship as far as I know, because this is on a State formula and, in effect, you just cannot spend all the money now to do it.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURLESON. Does the gentleman have in mind how this sum compares with what they had in the last fiscal year?

Mr. HÉBERT. It was less than this amount. I do not recall the exact amount, and I am unable to find it immediately. Perhaps the gentleman can aid me.

Mr. BURLESON. But this is a greater sum than the same service had appropriated last year?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes. This is in addition, and that is what I am pointing out, and I think it is very important, that we are not cutting down any of their services. We are taking off \$21 million and applying it only to the construction program.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PELLY. I did not understand that the Clerk had read beyond line 17.

May I inquire if this amendment includes the figure on line 20?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment that the gentleman from Louisiana offered was addressed to the language beginning on line 5 but does touch on a sum included in the next paragraph beginning on line 18.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk which would apply to line 17. If this amendment were acted on, would that prevent my amendment from being offered at the end of the paragraph which begins on line 5 and ends on line 17?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman applies to that portion between line 5 and line 17?

Mr. PELLY. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. It would be in order, because the Clerk has not read the next 3 lines, 18, 19, and 20.

Mr. FOGARTY. May I be heard, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. It was my understanding that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana went down to and included the language at the end of line 20 on page 25.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment does go down that far, but the Clerk has not read those last three lines.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that further amendments cannot be offered to the language before line 20 on page 25, because the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] takes in 3 places in the bill and goes down to and including the paragraph "Salaries and expenses" where his amendment offers to cut the amount in line 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The statement the gentleman makes is correct, but the fact remains no point of order was made when the amendment was read.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the point I was trying to make is that there were no objections raised when the amendment was offered and considered down through line 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The portion of the gentleman's amendment having to do with those three lines, lines 18, 19, and 20, can have no effect until those lines are read and then considered.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOGARTY. Is the gentleman's amendment in order when he has, in one amendment, sought to cut three places in the bill, from lines 5 to 20?

The CHAIRMAN. No point of order was raised against it.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thought that would be a concession that those lines had been read, the lines down to and including line 20.

The CHAIRMAN. It is no concession until such time as that portion of the bill is read.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if no objection were made, would that preclude the consideration of my amendment which begins on line 17, following the action on the



amendment of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT]?

The CHAIRMAN. No.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to say at the outset, as has been said by other Members, that I am just as interested in economy in government as anyone, as my better judgment will allow.

We have been considering this bill for several days. I want to commend and applaud the committee in charge of this appropriation bill; as well as the patience and indulgence of the membership of this House, including the leadership, for taking the time in discussing so thoroughly these matters of so much importance to the people of America.

In my experience, Mr. Chairman, this is I believe the first time, recently anyway, that the House has taken time thoroughly to debate and discuss these matters of so much importance to the American people.

I am not one of those, however, who believe that the way to economize is to deliberately use the meat ax. We have a program here under consideration that has been in effect since 1945. It is generally known as the Hill-Burton Act.

Our Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce under the leadership of the late beloved Percy Priest, working with Jim Dolliver, of Iowa, who was in this House for a long time, reported the first bill of this kind, which later became the Hill-Burton program.

I would say, Mr. Chairman, during these 12 years there has been no program that has been received with more popular acclaim, that has provided for a greater need, that has contributed more to the health and welfare of our people, than this program for hospitals. It was a sad record that we had revealing insufficient hospital facilities throughout this great Nation of ours to give some relief to human suffering.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. No; not just now, if the gentleman will permit me.

Mr. HÉBERT. I just want to subscribe to what the gentleman is saying and agree with him.

Mr. HARRIS. The gentleman subscribes and agrees, yet he reduces the program by about \$21 million. That would reduce the long-range program established by a survey in every State in the Union.

Mr. HÉBERT. If the gentleman can tell me where one single hospital will not be built, then I should agree with him that this amendment should not be offered. Name just one hospital.

Mr. HARRIS. I can cite the gentleman hospitals in his own State that will not be built.

Mr. HÉBERT. Name one.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit me, I will cite the record.

Since this program was established with the first appropriation in the fiscal year 1948, the great State of Louisiana, ably represented by him and other distinguished Members of this House, has had a total allocation of over \$24 million.

More than \$23 million of Federal funds have been expended in his State for this program. More than 10,000 beds of a general hospital program have been realized from this program. There are many projects pending. Applications before the Department are pending to meet the needs of general hospital beds. Of your own State, 3,444 are needed.

This is from a survey made by his own State organization. To reduce this appropriation by some 20 percent would reduce the number of projects that could be approved in the next fiscal year by that amount.

Now, with reference to this so-called or alleged unobligated balance, the appropriation under the authorization for this program is available for obligation for 2 years. It then reverts to the Treasury.

Let me say here, that since this program was inaugurated \$800 million of Federal funds has been provided. Local sponsors of projects throughout the country have in addition provided \$1,600,000,000, a tremendous program. Included with these projects are 37 university medical school hospitals. This is where they turn out doctors to administer to the sick and afflicted.

Back to the so-called unobligated funds. It takes time for a community to initiate a program and to develop it. Now let me explain the practical problem. These programs are developed in four parts: Part 1 is the initial approval; that takes time. Part 2 is the finance plan; that requires more time. Part 3 is the site acquisition. This always requires some time to work out. Part 4 is for the drawing of plans, the architectural work, and it is at this stage when the money is obligated. This always requires 1 to 2 years. Generally, 18 to 20 months.

Now that should explain to anyone the simplicity of the program and that these so-called unexpended balances actually do not exist. This is so because during the course of the year in following the procedure as to the four-part stages, most of the money is in the process of obligation.

To show that this is true beyond any doubt, whatsoever, is that out of the \$800 million of Federal funds for this program, in the last 12 years, only about \$1 million has actually reverted to the Treasury.

Therefore, the so-called unobligated balances which my colleagues have referred to, have apparently been promised to communities. The money has been allocated to the States for this purpose.

Furthermore, make no mistake about this, the law does not permit any funds allocated to one State to be transferred and expended in another State. This was to insure each State that it would have its full allocation under the formula.

Furthermore, there is a total annual authorization of \$150 million a year for this program, but the Congress has established an annual appropriation of around \$90 million and \$100 million for the last several years.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HARRIS. Just a minute, now. I do not have much time and I cannot get an extension of time.

Mr. HÉBERT. I just want the gentleman to be correct, that is all.

Mr. HARRIS. I think I know something about this program and if I am wrong on any statement I stand corrected, but I get the impression that the gentleman offered his amendment to reduce the appropriation simply for the reason of economizing, without taking into consideration the need for the program in the vital interest of sick people.

That is what we are faced with here today. Last year we reduced the appropriation. Again this year we are reducing it.

Every State has a program worked out, and it is worked out under a hospital survey program within the State. The States which operate this program are depending upon the Congress meeting its share so the bond structure can be made effective.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely appeal to my colleagues to vote against this reduction in this vital and essential program. Human suffering is of much greater concern to me than what I believe to be false economy.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this point in the bill to make it very clear that although I have supported some of the cuts and will support others I am considering each one on its own merits.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for just one very brief statement?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that there are many sponsors of this program throughout the United States which have voted bond issues? Their local people are for this program. To reduce it as is sought to be done here would further nullify the action by the voters for those projects.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think the gentleman is correct.

In making decisions on the amendment I am basing my judgment on the implications of every amendment. These paragraphs in the bill touch upon matters which have been my deep concern over a long period of years. At the moment we are considering among other things the building of additional hospitals.

Can this be done intelligently when no one seems to have an answer to the problem of how they are to be staffed? We do need hospitals, but we also need the nursing and medical staff for these hospitals and clinics and rehabilitation facilities and nursing homes which are so needed throughout the country.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. HÉBERT. I would direct your attention to what I said in my opening statement that none of these facilities are cut at all by this amendment.

I did not want there to be any confusion about that.

Mrs. BOLTON. There is none, I am sure, but I am speaking generally.

Wards in all too many hospitals have been closed because of a lack of nurses to care for patients who should be in those beds. Even whole sections of certain hospitals cannot function because of the lack of personnel. Beginning with line 21, on page 25, which has not yet been read, there is set aside money for various public health needs. Among these are additional funds for traineeships for graduate nurses to prepare them for teaching posts. The shortage of teachers of nursing has created a very real bottleneck in the process of increasing the number of professional nurses so dramatically needed by our sick.

I am delighted to find there are adequate funds in this bill to continue that program. If you will read the testimony given by Miss Arnstein on page 613, you will see that she says:

As I said, there are signs the situation is improving somewhat. In 1948 there were 32 nurses per 100 patients in our general hospitals. In 1955 there were 36. An increase of 4 per 100 patients. \* \* \*

While the professional nurses—what we call the R. N.—have been increasing slightly, the auxiliaries have been increasing tremendously, so that we had 57 nursing personnel per 100 patients in 1948 and we have 84 nursing personnel per 100 patients in our hospitals in 1955.

But that does not mean that we have an adequate number of trained nurses. Most of the increases in bedside nursing personnel has been in auxiliaries. We need them. We need every one of them, but we also need trained nurses and trained administrators and trained supervisors. The hospitals which are said to have benefited by this increase in personnel are largely the general hospitals, not the hospitals for maternity, tuberculosis, and psychiatry, and so on. While the situation with respect to general hospitals may have improved slightly, and I certainly hope it has, we still very much need an increase of technically trained nurses. Because I know the continuing problems created by nurse shortage, I am in favor of the grants for nurse traineeships, which will help open the bottleneck caused by a dearth of teacher nurses. And because I am in favor of all the hospitals we feel we can build, I am particularly regretful that during the discussions on this bill that concerns itself with the hearts of the people of this country, that has to do with the vital heart of the life of this country, that there has been intruded into it so much partisan politics. It has no place in this bill, Mr. Chairman. We should not permit ourselves to appeal to the baser elements in men and women; we should keep this discussion on a very high plane. Because such intrusions militate very seriously not only against the prestige of the committee, but also against the best interests of the people of this country, I cannot but protest the nature of some of the debate on this bill. We have a heavy responsibility, Mr. Chairman, one to which we should be giving the best that is in us.

The work of this subcommittee is so outstanding that it should have no shadow cast upon it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would first like to compliment the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] on her remarks on this amendment. It may be that some of you do not know that she has had long experience in this field, and I think we would do well to listen to what she has said.

I am no expert on hospitals, but in the past week I have had occasion to visit one several times where my father was a patient. Every time I went through I had to walk around three corridors, thread my way through a narrow passage to get to the end of the corridor where he was lying ill. And why did I have to thread my way? Because the hallways of that hospital had beds end to end, and they were not empty beds, they were beds with patients in them.

If this amendment is going to do anything to slow down the hospital building program now, next year, or the year after, then I say we should proceed very cautiously in doing it. I talked to some of the nurses in that hospital and they said: "We could do a better job for more patients if we had the necessary number of rooms to put them in and could get them out of the hallways where it is almost impossible to give them the kind of treatment that they need."

We defeated an amendment here a little while ago for the treatment of stream pollution. I heard people say yesterday that some cities have built their own treatment plants; why does not everyone do it?

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. MORANO. The amendment was carried. It was not defeated.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I meant the money was stricken out of the bill. The amendment carried.

Some of these cities do have their own sewage treatment plants. Cincinnati on the Ohio River was mentioned as using the water out of the Ohio into which smaller cities up the river are dumping untreated sewage. I pointed out in a private conversation on the floor that it costs almost as much for a city of 5,000 to build a sewage treatment plant as it does for a city of 100,000. The only difference is, the small city cannot bond its people for the expenditure of that money. I realize it costs more for a larger city, but the basic elements, the architect's plans and all of that are just the same almost regardless of the size of the city. Some of the people in the larger cities are not doing themselves any service when they prohibit the smaller towns and cities from building sewage disposal plants and allowing them to continue to pollute the river.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. I want to say to the gentleman that if I thought that my amendment would deprive this Nation's sick of one single hospital bed I would

not have offered the amendment. I am strictly in accord with the Hill-Burton program. I believe it is a magnificent program. This amendment of mine merely puts in order certain necessary economies.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. The gentleman, I am sure, is sincere and I hesitate to oppose him, but it seems to me the logic of his argument boils down to this: The Hill-Burton program is a fine program, let us cut it.

Mr. HÉBERT. Oh, no; I am not cutting the program.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I do not know how the cutting of \$21 million would affect the program. I am not a mathematician. If the gentleman wants to talk about the garden variety mathematician, I think I can qualify. I know one thing, the cutting of \$21 million out of a construction program is not going to get more hospitals built.

Mr. HÉBERT. They would still have \$86 million of unobligated funds.

Mr. PRICE. I would like to point out to the gentleman from Louisiana that this does not cut the amount he sets forth in his amendment, but 3 times that amount because this is a matching fund, one-third by the Federal Government, one-third by the States, and one-third by the local hospitals.

Mr. HÉBERT. These funds have not been matched yet.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I realize that.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If it does not stop the building of any hospital rooms, how is it going to save money?

Mr. HÉBERT. It is going to save the money which we appropriate this year and which is being utilized.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If it is not being spent it would not be saving anything.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone wants to cripple the hospital program, but this problem of unexpended balances carried over year by year is rather silly bookkeeping. Here is a situation where you have \$80 million appropriated for this purpose and unexpended because they have not been able to get enough calls to consume the total. That \$80 million will go on to next year. In connection with the armed services we have I do not know how many hundreds of millions of dollars of unexpended balances. In foreign aid you have the same situation of hundreds of millions of dollars of unexpended balances. Why do we not use the unexpended balances and help balance the budget for 1958? That is what I cannot understand.

Now, we have had so much sobbing and weeping and wailing about this bill. Every time anybody has undertaken to cut out anything in this bill somebody has gotten up and said, "If you do this thing you will cut the heart out of this bill." I never saw an animal with as many hearts as this bill appears to have, because there has not been a single thing that you cut out of here that you did not take out one heart at least.

Now I think it is about time we got down to business on this bill. We have



had everything from holding out the tin cup and taking pennies away from a blind man when somebody wanted to cut out some unnecessary expenditure. Then we have had the hospital thing. They said somebody is going to be deprived of some bed, when they have some \$80 million laying around waiting.

Now, is it not about time for us to dry our tears, wipe away our tears and do what we are supposed to do here, sit down and look at this thing from a commonsense standpoint and stop appropriating unnecessary funds?

For instance, I had a questionnaire this morning sent me by a disgusted Republican from Ohio. It was 4 pages and contained at least 100 questions, which asked the fellow how many cigarettes he smoked a day, whether he smoked cigarettes, did he smoke cigars or a pipe, did he chew tobacco, or did he take snuff. And all through that were questions, how old were you when you started smoking? How old were you when you stopped smoking? How many cigarettes do you smoke a day? Now, that sounds like a little old thing to talk about, but after all, when you add up all the time it took to make those questionnaires out or the time it took to send them out, all the postage it took and all the postage it took to get them back, and then all the time of this billion dollars a month worth of Federal employees it took and whatever use is going to be made of those questionnaires, it adds up to a lot of money.

Now, we have been accused—what was that word the President used the other day when we cut little amounts out of this program—that we were being fatuous. Well, I did not look that up in the dictionary, but I do not think it was meant to be complimentary to the House of Representatives. Now, if we make a broadside cut of 10 percent, as somebody has suggested, then we are using the meat ax, of course; if we try to do it the only way we can, the common sense way, in connection with unobligated appropriations, we are accused of being fatuous. Now, you can pay your money and take your choice, but just let us use a little common sense and not pile up this money in these bureaus and invite them to spend more than they need and more than the country can afford.

If you have tears to shed, save a few of them for the American taxpayer—the forgotten man.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to rise and speak on this amendment, but I have some knowledge of hospitals and the health of this country, and I have a vital interest in it.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. I tried to get the gentleman from Virginia to yield, because I have a genuine desire to do what he suggested, and that is to do something about this military budget. But I wonder if the gentleman from Virginia or anybody else thinks that if we offer some amendments to cut the military budget—

and remember, that is where two-thirds of this spending is—we will have very little of a chance of getting anybody to walk through the aisles on a teller vote to cut where the real cut can be effected.

I walked out of this building the other day when the temperature was 70, and there was a Chevrolet car out there, an Army car, with a sergeant sitting in it, with the motor running. And I assumed it was not to keep warm. And I just said to him, "What is the motor running for?" He said, "Well, I want to be ready to go when the general comes." Now, if you have 20 of them sitting around with the motor running, I do not know how many gallons of gas they will burn an hour, but it will amount to a considerable sum at the end of the year. But I wonder if anybody is going to help us cut that budget.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Because my name has been mentioned by my good friend from Ohio, I want to say that when the time comes to cut the military budget, wherever there is a dollar proposed that I think is unnecessary to the defense of this country, I will vote for it, and I will vote for it on any other bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, what I rose to say is this: In my State they have been appropriating money for the last few years to survey a dry canal. They say they are going to improve navigation. They are going to make a canal 200 miles long right alongside a river. They are going to pump the water out of the river in order to make the canal navigable. And it is going to cost this Government and local interests in the neighborhood of \$200 million before they are through with it. I am going to oppose that. When the time comes to vote on that bill—and you vote it up every time; you gave them \$250,000 the year before last and \$150,000 last year—I am just wondering how many of you will vote to cut that out. And if you will, it will help to balance the budget so that we may go ahead and build some hospitals, which we need and quit fooling around with the health of our people.

We have plenty of places where we can cut, if we want to. We can cut out the entire foreign aid appropriation and it will not hurt a soul in the entire United States of America. There is enough money in their pipeline to operate for 3 years without any additional appropriation. Think that over. I will be here when the time comes, when both those bills come to the floor.

To think of the number of useless appropriations that this Congress votes for like the one I just mentioned and the thousands of people on the payroll that are useless to our Government, it is frightening to me to see the Congress go on a cutting spree and cut the heart out of a program which means so much to the health and welfare of all our people. There are those who wish to cut the entire pollution program out—a thing that endangers the health of hundreds of thousands of people in this great land of ours and renders many of our beautiful streams useless for water

for domestic purposes or for recreational purposes. Right here in Washington, the beautiful Potomac River is so polluted that our experts tell us that it will require many years of study and hard work before we can relieve it in any appreciable measure.

In my home State and in my district, we have some beautiful streams; one of them at one time was voted the most beautiful river in the world, Ouchita River. Today these streams are so badly polluted that the fish have died. The water has become so salty that the salt-water fish have come in and taken over and the thousands of fine fresh-water fish are almost extinct. Let us stop, look, and listen before we start cutting the health and welfare program. As I said before and I now repeat, we can cut off billions of dollars that will not affect any program in this great land of ours and I expect to watch for some of these bills and when they come to the floor of the House, I am going to call Congress' attention to them and see how many of you economy minded Members will join me in making cuts where they should be made.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to direct the attention of the Committee, and particularly that of my good friend, the distinguished chairman of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, to a statement appearing on the news ticker, quoting the President as saying, in his press conference this morning, in response to a question, that it would be possible to cut Federal personnel a great deal without the operation of the Government suffering unduly.

Since that is one of the purposes of many of these amendments, and has been the constant purpose of the Manpower Utilization Subcommittee under the able chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS], I suggest that we on the subcommittee proceed to the task of cooperating with the President on that score.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, despite protestations to the contrary the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana substantially reducing the appropriations for grants for hospital construction will result in a reduction of the number of hospital beds to be provided in the United States in the next 2 years.

The shortage of hospital beds is already a national scandal. There is not a State in the Union where this shortage is not a serious problem.

The Hill-Burton Act is one of Congress' finest contributions to our national welfare. At the time of its consideration in Congress it had almost unanimous approval. Yet Congress has never fully implemented the act by the original programed appropriations deemed necessary to cope with the problem the legislation seeks to solve. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana would further reduce the good effect of this important program.

Each Member of Congress can speak best for the needs in his own area. I can attest to serious shortage of hospital beds in the St. Clair-Madison County area of Illinois. An addition to facilities at St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Granite City will help partially solve the local problem, but without Hill-Burton aid this progress will not be possible.

St. Elizabeth's has patiently waited several years for a Federal allocation to assist in financing its construction program. St. Elizabeth's will expand from a 100-bed hospital to 200 beds to service an industrial area of 75,000. It is the only hospital in the community.

The Federal program will provide \$650,000 toward a total building cost of \$2,750,000. Let us not endanger the success of this hospital-construction program by reducing appropriation to implement the Hill-Burton Act. This program is worthy of our support. I urge my colleagues to defeat the Hébert amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, it does not make any difference how good a program is, it is not good judgment, nor is it good financing to appropriate more money than can be intelligently and effectively used, and just have it kicking around on the books. I have heard three different stories, and I do not know which one is the latest, of the amount of the unobligated balance here. One is \$86 million; another \$90 million; another \$96 million. That is the amount that will be unobligated at the end of the year. If you add any one of those amounts to the \$100 million that would be carried if this amendment is agreed to, they will have much more money than they can possibly use. Why should we be so profligate that we would set up money that could not possibly be used and that is not necessary at this time? I do not think it is good business or good policy, either.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who may desire to do so may extend their remarks at this point in the Record on the pending amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, last Friday I reminded the House that in spite of current indications that economy has become "the chief end of man," Bib-

lical teaching holds that charity, not economy, is considered the greatest virtue.

On Monday one of the able gentlemen of the Committee took issue with this interpretation and suggested that nowhere in the Scriptures can we find evidence that a trustee should be charitable with other people's money. Now, I make no claim to Biblical scholarship, but I must remind the gentleman that in one of the great parables the slothful servant is rebuked because he buried his talent in the ground rather than investing the talent entrusted to him in a constructive enterprise.

It seems to me that the men and women who elect us to high office do so with the expectation that we will not bury their tax funds in the ground, but will invest those funds in enterprises that bring the greatest possible benefit to the greatest number of people.

I have a very simple political philosophy which holds that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness continue to be the great goals of the American people. It is because of this conviction that I object to some of the economy proposals that have been made in recent days.

Every good citizen is in favor of economy. What disturbs me is that some gentlemen seek economy by crippling vital public programs essential to the health and the well-being of the American people. I object to the kind of economy moves that the President of the United States has described as fatuous and foolish.

I join with the President and the courageous gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in deploring shortsighted moves that save a few dollars now, but result eventually in tragic losses—both financial and human. I only wish that the President would fight as hard to save Modern Republicanism as has the gentleman from Rhode Island.

There is no true economy in the kind of action which the House took last week to curtail the Pure Food and Drug Administration efforts to safeguard the American people against harmful drugs or foodstuffs.

There is no true economy in the action we have just taken to curtail efforts to save our streams from contamination.

There is no true economy in the proposal now before us to curtail hospital construction and desperately needed hospital and nursing personnel.

There is no economy in curtailing the modest requests for research involving such tragic diseases as cancer, arthritis, heart disease, and mental illness.

As things now stand 1 out of 7 Americans will suffer and die from this terrible scourge. If the Members of Congress were a typical cross section of America, 62 of the 435 Members of the House who now sit in this body would die from cancer. The annual hospital bill alone of those suffering from cancer totals \$300,000. Yet, gentlemen talk about saving money by cutting efforts of our Government to bring this relentless killer under control.

Believing firmly in Federal economy, I would, nevertheless, rather go down to political defeat than cut one dollar from a medical-research program that

might someday save the life of one of my children, or the life of any one of the thousands of Americans who are destined to fall victims to cancer.

With 10 million Americans afflicted with heart disease, with another 10 million suffering from arthritis, with 1 out of 7 of us marked as cancer victims, with one out of each dozen children born this year needing institutional care for mental illness at some time during his life, how can we honestly begrudge the meager Federal investment in medical research.

It is significant that the Department of Agriculture spent in 1955 for research on plant and animal diseases \$10 million more than the United States Public Health Service devoted to research for all four of the deadly human diseases I have just mentioned.

I am completely in favor of research in the field of plant and animal diseases. I only ask that we do not reverse the action of the last Congress which demonstrated at least as much concern for the afflictions of men, women, and children as for the afflictions of the potato and the pig.

Modest as it has been, there is no denying the fact that research stimulated by World War II has already paid rich dividends in terms of a healthier America.

Between 1944 and 1952, we cut in half deaths from pneumonia, kidney diseases, TB, and syphilis; influenza fatalities were cut three-fourths; deaths from appendicitis and rheumatic fever were reduced by two-thirds. All in all, during this 8-year period, we added another 5 years to the life span of the American citizen.

When we talk about slashing the budget, we must never forget that the major portion of our budget is devoted, not to welfare measures, but to military defense and the cost of past wars. It is in this area primarily that any substantial cuts in Federal spending will have to be made.

Programs that fall within the classification of "health, education, and welfare" are, indeed, a comparatively minor part of our total budget.

In their book, *Ethics in a Business Society*, Marquis Childs and Douglass Cate cite the following facts:

In 1950 the richest nation of the world spent less than 5 cents of each Federal tax dollar for public assistance for widows, orphans, the aged, and the blind, to help educate the Nation's youth, rehabilitate the handicapped, eradicate slums, erect low-rent public housing, improve the people's health, meet the cost of all national parks, museums and libraries, and support the national school-lunch program. . . . To pay for them Uncle Sam collected less than 1 percent of the national income in fiscal 1950. For the Nation as a whole, our use of public funds—local, State, and Federal—for health, education, and assistance to the needy amounts to two-thirds of our spending on liquor and tobacco.

We need, once in awhile, to take a look at our scale of values, both as individuals and as a nation. This is particularly true when it comes to our Federal budget. Some of the same gentlemen who have attacked medical research programs have attacked the Rural Li-



brary Services Act on the twin grounds that it would cost too much money or is a function that should be provided by the States.

Permit me to say that the people of my great State of South Dakota are as economy minded as those of any of the 48 States and they do not favor unnecessary extension of Federal power. But when I asked my fellow South Dakotans to give me the high privilege of representing them in the Congress, I stated very clearly my firm conviction that this Government has a continuous responsibility to assist programs that are in the interest of a better America. Such a program is the Rural Library Services Act.

Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence, talked with deep conviction about the necessity of "the diffusion of knowledge" among the citizens of a democracy. How better can we promote "the diffusion of knowledge" than through the rural, traveling library service? I know that South Dakotans expect the Congress to use its powers to stabilize farm prices at a fair level. I am equally confident that the people of my State want the Congress to move on a modest scale to bring the blessings of good books to farm boys and girls. The minds of our children are certainly as vital to us as the very important matter of fair farm prices. I am not afraid to go on record in favor of a low-cost, modest program that has for its purpose "the diffusion of knowledge."

Economy in government? Yes, I favor that, and I will work tirelessly for it.

But what are we to say of ceremonious slashes in the budget now that later on may blight the health, the happiness, and the dignity of many thousands of Americans? No, Mr. Speaker. I will never go along with that false kind of economy. To do so would be to betray my conscience as a citizen, as a parent, and as a public servant.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I was quite disturbed yesterday by the remarks of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALECK] to the effect that a program, no matter how much it has to recommend it, should be terminated for the present since the country has such great national defense demands.

I am fully aware of the economic reasons to cut the Federal budget, particularly when there is waste involved. I am a firm believer in having Congress review most carefully the budget estimates which the Executive brings before us, and in this connection desire to commend the Committee on Appropriations and the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for a very fine job.

But I most strongly deplore a philosophy which totally disregards human values for the sake of Government economy. We have long recognized that there are certain programs which our local governments cannot carry on without Federal assistance. And when it comes to programs dealing with health or education, we cannot afford to sit back and wait. Children are children for only a certain period of time, and disease can easily lead to a national catastrophe. I find it hard to believe that anyone would

place States rights ahead of human rights.

I believe in the most careful analysis of appropriations bills, particularly in the military defense field. But I am not willing to make indiscriminate cuts, particularly when this deprives our people of services that mean so much to them. It is my hope that when items are considered in the budget, that we consider the value of the program first before we apply the general principle of economy. We should think long and hard before we sweep aside the studied recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations.

Finally, I believe all of the people are well aware that these programs cost money. And yet they also know many of these problems have been getting worse from year to year and that we have been wasting both our natural and our human resources. Unless we tackle some of these problems, and tackle them hard, this country will be in serious trouble in a few years. Money spent today in many of these areas is an investment that will pay us back manifold in the future. Too many Members of this House want to sit on States rights rather than do something with them. Federal grants-in-aid help activate States rights and spur localities to action. And action is needed if we are to meet the needs of the people and avoid costly effects on the future. This amendment is certainly a glaring example of pure folly. I hope it will be defeated and if not when we meet the issue again in the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the history of this legislation is that the authorizing bill was passed in 1946 under the leadership of Senator HILL and former Senator BURTON, who is now a Justice of the Supreme Court. This is called the Hill-Burton Act. The first appropriation was made in 1948. The full authorization, for which we voted unanimously here in the House, without one vote against it, is \$150,000,000 for the original features of the act. We voted unanimously here to extend this act on two or three occasions, and by unanimous vote we expanded the act and increased the authorization to \$210 million, not the \$121 million we have before you now. The \$121 million we have in the bill is \$3,800,000 less than we had last year.

The gentleman from Louisiana has consistently said that this will not cut out one hospital bed. Someone gave him the answer a moment ago. If you are going to cut \$21 million from this bill you are certainly going to cut out hospital beds because the money cannot be expended for any other purpose.

What is the story about the unobligated balances? There is \$80 million unobligated now out of \$250 million, because when this act was passed in 1946 they allowed the obligation of these funds to run for 2 years because it takes time for the communities to plan these buildings.

What is the history of these unobligated balances? We have appropriated since 1948 over \$900 million for this program and only \$1 million, only \$1 million out of almost a billion dollars, has

been turned back into the Federal Treasury, because it was not obligated by the end of the 2-year period provided in the basic law. Is that cause for us to get alarmed by an unobligated balance of \$80 million now, when the record shows despite anything that has been said on this amendment that out of over \$900 million we have appropriated, only \$1 million has not been used?

I will say to my distinguished friend from Louisiana that Louisiana is one of the States that has taken advantage of this program 100 percent. What are the needs down there now? Are you taking care of the needs? You still have a 25-percent deficit in the needed bed capacity in the State of Louisiana. When the gentleman offers this amendment to cut \$21 million from this bill, he is hurting his own State.

Let me tell you what the record shows: You have already received, under this program, \$25 million of Federal funds to help build needed beds in the State of Louisiana. In Louisiana now you have a deficit of 3,500 general hospital beds. That is what you need in the State of Louisiana in order to meet decent standards for the care of your people.

As far as unobligated balances are concerned, you have \$400,000 of unobligated balances in Louisiana, but over the period of 10 years not one single dollar has been turned back by the State of Louisiana.

You are not only hurting your own State, you are hurting the entire program. I do not care what you say or anybody else says, when you cut \$21 million out of this program you are denying the building of beds that are needed now.

What is the overall need? It is estimated that there is a deficit of 850,000 beds in this country. Do you know how many beds this appropriation will build in 1958? Fifteen thousand. Private interests will build maybe 30,000. That is 45,000. But we need because of the increase in population and obsolescence a minimum of hospital facilities for 55,000 more beds this year just to keep from falling further behind. So with all that is being done with the full amount that we have allowed plus all the private money that will be put into the building of hospitals, we are still going to have an increase in the deficit because of population and obsolescence of 10,000 beds in 1958. You are trying to make the situation worse by this amendment. If there is any section of the country that has benefited most as a result of this program, it is the South, especially the rural areas, because most of these buildings and facilities have been built in rural areas and towns with less than 5,000 population.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HEBERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HEBERT) there were—ayes 85, noes 107.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HEBERT and Mr. FOGARTY.

The Committee again divided and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 106, noes 126.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PELLY: Page 25, before the period at the end of line 17, insert the following: "Provided further, That no project shall be constructed in whole or in part with funds appropriated by this paragraph unless the application filed under section 625 or section 654 of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the project includes assurances that upon its completion its services and facilities will be made available without distinction on the basis of race."

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, the funds provided in this bill, H. R. 6287, for grants to States for hospitals and related facilities are administered, as I understand, under the laws of the respective States where the projects are to be constructed. I have no quarrel with keeping the Federal Government out of local affairs, but I do not approve of Federal money going into projects which will not be used in conformity with the law of the land.

A few days ago when the appropriation for the Housing and Home Finance Agency was under consideration here in this Chamber I asked a Member of the Committee if the Federal Government was lending funds for construction of college buildings to educational institutions where there is discrimination on account of race. I was unsuccessful in getting the information, but I believe the answer in that case is that the policy can be controlled by the Agency itself and Executive action. I am pursuing that matter further.

Meanwhile, however, in the so-called Hill-Burton program to help meet the shortage of hospital beds, the only method of controlling the discriminatory aspects of matching grant projects such as are contemplated under H. R. 6287, at least at the moment would seem to be by limiting by law the use of the funds appropriated.

My amendment does not compel integration. It simply provides that these Federal funds will only go toward financing construction of hospitals, diagnostic centers, rehabilitation facilities, and nursing homes where prior assurance has been given that services and facilities will be available without distinction on account of race.

I strongly urge adoption of this amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

In Cannon's Precedents in the House of Representatives, under the heading "Construed as Legislation and Not Limitations, Therefore Not Admitted on Appropriation Bills," I would like to call the attention of the Chair that this amendment goes farther than a limitation. It contains an affirmative direction that applications must contain certain assurances. This would obviously place additional duties on the Secretary of the Department and officials of the United States Public Health Service to determine that the directives were carried out.

Then I refer to page 67, Cannon's Precedents, under the heading "Executive Discretion and Limitation Coupled With Affirmative Direction," and the following page, at the top, to the provision that no part of an appropriation should be used except in a certain way, thereby restricting Executive discretion to the extent of imposing new duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Washington desire to be heard?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I submit this is a limitation on the use of the funds. I do not believe it would entail any additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] offers an amendment to which the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] raises a point of order, and suggests that the language of the amendment includes additional duties that would be imposed upon someone to determine the assurance to be given as well as the purposes at the time the application is made and under what sections of the Public Health Service Act.

The question has been raised a number of times previously. Volume 7, page 696, section 1706 of Cannon's Precedents deals with the problem very clearly and reads:

To be admissible on an appropriation bill a limitation may not include affirmative directions imposing additional duties on executives.

A limitation may not give affirmative directions, impose new duties, or be accompanied by language not directly limiting the appropriation.

The Chair, therefore, holds that the point of order is well taken and sustains the point of order.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POWELL: On page 25, line 17, before the period insert "Provided, That no part of any appropriation contained in this section shall be used for any of the purposes therein mentioned by any agency or facility which segregates citizens in facilities offered, services performed, and granted on account of race, color, ancestry or religion."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the amendment is not germane for the same reason that the other amendment was not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that the sum and substance of the gentleman's argument?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. It is, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say this amendment in exact language as submitted has been held to be germane for the 13 years I have been a Member of the House of Representatives and I submit the following pages in the RECORD: For instance, in the 83d Congress, 1st session, volume 99, part 5, page 5921, where the Parliamentarian upheld my views.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, having ruled on a quite similar motion back in 1946 when the District of Columbia appropriation bill was up for consideration. The Chair held then that it was a limitation on the use of the money and so holds now, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. In ancient Rome a senator—I think his name was Cato—once said that he would rather the people would ask why there was no statue of him than why there was one. As I have listened today to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, I feel he belongs in the former class, as do many who will argue both pro and con on this amendment. This is just a question of doing what one thinks is right, as far as I am concerned. I have been in this Congress for a number of sessions, and often it has to be a member of a race other than mine who offers such an amendment to protect his race. I, as a member of my race, wanted this time to get ahead of such a gentleman and offer this particular amendment. I am sorry my amendment was not germane, but I shall support the gentleman. It is time we ceased putting Federal funds into projects not in accord with the law of the land.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I can ask the gentleman from Washington a question?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. This program, as the gentleman from Washington knows, has been in effect since 1945. That is when the first authorization was granted. It has been a very effective program throughout the United States during all this time. Can the gentleman tell the committee if there has been any complaint whatsoever in regard to the subject matter that the gentleman brings up now in any given area, in any hospital anywhere?

Mr. POWELL. I am sorry I cannot yield any more time, but I will answer that question.

Mr. HARRIS. I wanted the gentleman from Washington to answer.

Mr. POWELL. First, I would like to say this amendment comes from the gentleman from Washington without my foreknowledge until he informed me a couple of days ago. I thought his amendment might not be germane, so



that is why I prepared this, and I would like the authorship to be considered as that of the gentleman from Washington.

Yes; I do have a complaint before me from New Orleans, La., concerning a hospital in St. Charles, La. The letter comes to me from a white attorney, Maurice P. Gatlin, 1607 Claibourne Tower, New Orleans, La., in which he sent me a copy he addressed to the HEW asking the HEW to tell him whether or not the new hospital to be built was going to be built in accordance with the law of the land or would it be built in accordance with the illegal practices as outlawed by the Supreme Court decision. The HEW replied to him that lacking a directive from the Congress they would have to build the new hospital in St. Charles, La., under the old law prior to the Supreme Court decision of 1954. I submit it is proper to bring the practice of Congress up to the level of the Supreme Court. This amendment is nonracial; it is bipartisan; it is based on sound moral grounds; it is based on legal grounds, and if you are interested in placing economy on the highest level rather than on the basis of subterfuge and hypocrisy, this is it. I offer this only because my colleague from Washington did not have his amendment sustained.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 8 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, the argument can and has been made that this hospital program, since its inception, has operated with few or no complaints without the necessity of such an amendment as has been offered by the gentleman from New York. Mr. POWELL, however, has pointed out a specific incident and a ruling by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which calls for new Congressional guidance to the Department.

This is again an opportunity to stress the fact that there can be no compromise on the fundamental rights of all our citizens. Either there is true equality, recognized as the law by all who must administer it, or we have such a situation as has been described by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. Since such situations are allowed to continue in existence, we offer to our powerful enemies a readymade argument that we do not truly intend to give more than lip service to the basic constitutional rights of all our citizens. I am afraid there are still many that for the sake of expediency are not going to face issues squarely. There are many who fear that this amendment will en-

danger the hospital program in the other body. If their fears are justified, it only reemphasizes the need to meet them that the American position may be removed from doubt, and our stand firm and clear.

I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY], whose intent was perfectly clear and whose amendment could not be considered because of the rules of the Committee. If the cause of complete justice does not win today, I hope its backers will return to the battle over and over again until victory is assured.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. On several other occasions, during the debate on this bill, I have opposed what I thought was legislation on an appropriation bill. If there have been any complaints about the administration of this program, I have not heard any in the 11 years I have been on this subcommittee appropriating funds for the program.

If there are specific complaints, I think they should be directed to the committee in charge of the legislation, and there should not be an attempt to take care of them in an appropriation bill in the form of a limitation such as has been suggested here today.

This program has been working well since 1948, since the first appropriation was made. I am afraid if we get into proposals such as this we are only going to get into a lot more redtape and create confusion. I submit the best way is to go before the proper legislative committee and, if there are any complaints, get them straightened out in that way.

I hope the amendment is rejected.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Chairman, I believe the budget could be drastically cut but this week's debate shows that many do not carefully consider what can be cut. Much time and oratory has been consumed in cutting appropriations for public health, postal service, anti-water pollution, and many other items completely in the public interest. Those who are in the lead today in this debate to cut these essential public activities will soon be confronted by a bill appropriating billions for foreign aid. I will not miss the mark much when I say now that on these foreign appropriations, those who now are so concerned about economizing will vote "yes" on every possible occasion that will tend to make this foreign-aid money available.

When we consider that we have appropriated for foreign aid \$130 billion since 1940 we can well ask if this money has been wisely spent. The tables of foreign expenditures for foreign aid found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday last presented by Hon. LAWRENCE SMITH,

of Wisconsin, are almost unbelievable. I am certain that another huge appropriation will be made this year for the same purpose supported by those who want to curtail and greatly handicap the Public Health Service, needed money for elimination of pollution in our navigable rivers, deny any attempt to make the farmers' dollars as valuable as dollars of any other business enterprise. That is all any support program aims doing, but I am afraid the public will find that the Members of Congress who are proclaiming necessary cuts in the budget will limit their activities to small but essential things that this country demands. They have an opportunity to track down an elephant—huge foreign aid—but when the showdown comes they will prefer to track down a rabbit instead; they prefer to get rid of potato bugs by pulling up the potato plants; they prefer to hoe up the cornstalks and let the weeds grow.

I have always voted for appropriations to further the economy of our own people, and with very few exceptions the budget does not contain unnecessary domestic demands. We can save 20 percent of this huge expenditure by limiting foreign aid, and gradually come to a point where it will be cut out altogether.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The question was taken; and on a division, demanded by Mr. POWELL, there were—ayes 70, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Construction of Indian health facilities: For construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable buildings; and purchase of trailers; \$3,096,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That such expenditures may be made through the Department of the Interior.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PILLION: On page 27, strike out lines 13 to 20, inclusive.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to eliminate an appropriation item of \$3,096,000 for the construction of Indian health facilities.

On page 17 of the committee report, the committee states that this amount is allowed only for "alterations" and "other plant facilities." The report specifically rejects funds for "hospitals, clinics, and personnel quarters."

The intent of the committee as expressed in the report is completely at variance with the language of this bill.

The language of the bill states the purpose of this appropriation to be:

First. The construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel.

This language clearly includes hospitals, clinics, and personnel quarters.

Now, by every rule of statutory construction, the unambiguous language of a bill prevails over a mere observation in a committee report.

In effect, the plain language of this bill appropriates \$3,096,000 for exactly the purposes which the committee, in its report, wishes to disallow, that is, hospitals, clinics, and personnel quarters.

The second objection to this item is the one made by the committee itself in its report. On page 17, the committee states that no allowance is made for these purposes because "such a large unobligated balance exists."

This Bureau had \$5,535,000 available in fiscal 1956. An additional \$8,762,000 was appropriated for fiscal 1957. Of the total, \$13,297,000, only \$2,304,000 was obligated as of January 1, 1957.

On page 631 of the President's budget, it is estimated that 1958 expenditures will be \$3,476,000.

The Bureau now has more than \$10 million on hand that is unobligated. At the present rate of obligation, the Bureau has sufficient funds to continue its program until beyond January 1, 1960, without any part of the \$3,096,000 asked for in this item.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PILLION. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. I have here some figures that I have just obtained. They show unexpended and unallocated funds as of March 28, 1957, of \$10,203,000, so the effect of the gentleman's amendment would just be to keep from piling up on top of these unexpended funds another \$3 million; is that not correct?

Mr. PILLION. That is exactly correct. One of the great errors we are making in this House is in permitting these bureaus to have funds for more than 1 year, for 5 or 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a brief comment upon this debate.

After listening to the charges and countercharges made by some of our distinguished Members, it would appear that we may be losing sight of the ultimate goal of this drive for a reduction in appropriations.

I dare say every Member of this House is in favor of a balanced budget, some reduction in taxes, and some reduction in our public debt.

Before this session ends, and certainly during the next session, both political parties will be competing to take credit for tax-reduction proposals.

The distinguished chairman of this committee has repeatedly emphasized the relationship between a vote for an authorization and a vote for an appropriation. Actually, the relationship is only a slight one.

There is, however, an inevitable cause and effect relationship between appropriations and taxes.

Today's reductions in appropriations are tomorrow's tax cuts.

My votes for reductions in appropriations are motivated by a personal goal for tax reductions.

I would vote for an increase in personal exemptions from \$600 to \$700. This would cost about \$2.3 billion per year.

I would vote for a corresponding reduction in business and excise taxes of about \$1.5 billion per year.

I would like to see a minimum surplus of \$2 billion applied to a reduction of our national debt.

I expect to vote for a minimum of \$5 billion in appropriation reductions. This action will, in my own mind, justify my anticipated votes for tax reductions.

If each Member could work out his own personal tax reduction program and vote to reduce appropriations by the same approximate figure, this House could produce some astounding and constructive results.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION] has expired.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for an additional minute.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I must object, especially since this is an excellent statement and one that the House badly needs to hear.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois object?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind the House that in August of 1954 the 83d Congress transferred all the Indian health services from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Public Health Service. That was just 2½ years ago. That was a bill which was introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] and it was reported out by Republican committees on both sides of the Congress. When the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] testified about this bill before the Committee on the Interior, he said:

I recognize perfectly that the Public Health Service cannot perform miracles in this field and nobody is suggesting that right away they will be able to solve all the difficulties at hand. We recognize that there will be some difficulties and some administrative problems in such a transfer.

And there have been difficulties and there have been administrative problems. It has taken a long time to work out the details of such a transfer, but right now the Public Health Service is prepared and ready to go ahead and really to begin to build these Indian hospitals and do the job that is necessary.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HALEY. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this proposed appropriation will not add one thing to the construction of your hospitals because you now have \$7,851,400. So this will not do what the gentleman hopes it will do in building a hospital. Let me say to the gentleman from Montana, I think we should make progress with respect to Indian facilities for health, but I do not think this is the way to do it. I will go along with the gentleman in working on Indian health problems if the Department will come in here with a program that will move forward and make some progress on it. I cannot see where adding \$3 million on top of an unexpended, unobligated \$10 million will

do anything that the gentleman and I want to do.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Florida that I have a bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which will enable Indians and the surrounding communities to take advantage of some of this unobligated money. I will say to the gentleman that I have an amendment at the desk which I believe will facilitate the building of Indian hospitals by the Public Health Service.

But I want to point out that in the State of Montana there was at one time a tuberculosis death rate of 165 per hundred thousand Indians as against a death rate of 27.3 for non-Indians. As the result of an appropriation from Congress several years ago which built a 100-bed Indian tuberculosis hospital, that Indian death rate dropped from 165 per hundred thousand to 65.2 per hundred thousand, merely as the result of having adequate tuberculosis hospitalization for the Indians in the State of Montana.

I could read you statistics about the Indian health throughout the country that would alarm you. Ten times as many Indian babies die of gastritis and enteritis as white babies. The death rate from tuberculosis is more than 10 times the white death rate.

For pneumonia, in the State of Montana we have 1,543 cases per hundred thousand amongst Indians. The non-Indian death rate for the United States is 11.4. In other words the Indian death rate is more than 100 times greater.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks, and that the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. McGovern] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the move to cut funds for Indian health facilities. I know from personal observation and investigation that the health difficulties of the American Indian constitute a critical national problem.

The incidence of disease and death among our Indian citizens is so much higher than the average among whites that it constitutes a national disgrace. We cannot in good conscience deny to our Indian friends this modest request for medical facilities that can save the lives of thousands of Indian boys and girls, men and women.

When the first white settlers came to this country 300 years ago the Indian was already established here in a culture many hundreds of years old. What followed was the gradual deterioration of the Indian's society and his way of life. The red man was driven before the advancing white settlements and eventually confined to a few reservation areas.

Having disrupted Indian society and having assured the Indian that in exchange for his land we would help meet his basic human needs, we cannot now curtail a program vital to the health of these depressed people. Our first citizens are entitled to at least as adequate a point 4 program as we are provid-



ing for people in other lands. The blunt fact is that the Indian families of America and especially the Sioux Tribes of my State constitute the most tragically neglected group in our Nation today.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from New York who offered this amendment, that we stated specifically in our report that we did not allow any funds for the things he mentioned in his presentation before us; and I will say to the gentleman from Florida exactly the same thing.

This \$3,096,000 is a reduction of \$2,704,000 from the request that the administration made, and a reduction of \$5,666,000 below what we appropriated in 1957.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. Does the gentleman agree that the language of the bill is in accord with what the House is concerned with, what the Senate is concerned with, and what the administration is concerned with?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; I do not agree to that at all. The language of the report will supersede the language of the bill because it is under specific instructions that we have not allowed funds for these purposes.

We have allowed funds for only those two items on page 689 of the hearings. The first item that we changed was \$650,000 for hospital and clinics. We denied that; we did not give that to them.

The next item was personnel quarters, \$2,054,000. We denied that.

We did allow for alterations \$2,596,000 and \$500,000 for other plant facilities, because of the need that exists in the 56 hospitals they have at the present time.

If you could go through some of these hospitals on these reservations and see the condition, you would not try to stop this program of altering the hospitals so as to make them accredited hospitals. Those hospitals for which we now provide funds for alterations comprise just half of the program that has already been started and is already underway at a cost of some \$6 million.

All this \$3 million amounts to is that they will be given this two-million-five-hundred-thousand-some-odd dollars to continue the plan of alteration that will make them accredited hospitals under the standards of the Hill-Burton Act.

If you do not want to do that you should vote for the amendment.

The \$500,000 we have allowed is to provide sewage disposal plants and power facilities that are connected with existing facilities in these areas now.

There is not one dime in here for anything other than the things we have set forth in our report. They cannot, and I am sure they will not, go beyond the wording of the report in which we said specifically that none of these funds can be used for the purpose the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I gather from the statement of the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island that the money carried over from previous years is money which cannot be used for the purposes which the gentleman is attempting to correct.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman is positively right. The unobligated balances are committed to specific projects approved by the Congress in prior years and they are not available for new requirements.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman figures that if this program is to go on, the new money called for in this bill is required.

Mr. FOGARTY. All of this new money that we have in here is for alterations and improvement of plant facilities, some of which are inadequate. That is all and nothing else. We found fault with the administration of this program for not proceeding at a faster rate. It took them much more time to draw the plans and specifications for some of the housing for the Public Health personnel that we are trying to get, out in the field where the Indians are. If you vote for this amendment you are voting for substandard hospital facilities for these Indians. In that way you are making them second-class citizens. If you want to do that you will vote for this amendment.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to join the gentleman in his expression of opposition to this amendment. We have a tuberculosis death rate among Indians 10 times as high as that which exists among the non-Indian population. We have an infant mortality rate far above that of the non-Indian population. This is an effort to catch up and do something in a long-neglected field and I certainly hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. There has been a lot of discussion during this debate about whether the Congress and the Federal Government are responsible for helping build various facilities in the cities and States. But responsibility for the American Indian is a field about which there can be no question. It is strictly a Federal responsibility.

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. JUDD. We have our GI programs to help our soldiers who have been away from home 2 or 3 years become readjusted when they come back. We have point 4 programs all over the world to help other peoples achieve better health and gain skills. Would it not be an incredible proposition for us to cut down on these programs to help the Indians right here in America achieve health standards that will approach the levels of decency that we want for peoples abroad and which we have for ourselves?

Mr. FOGARTY. This amendment would have the effect of stopping in its tracks alterations that are going on, that have not been completed, which are in the process of being completed today. That is what this amendment would do and nothing else.

Mr. JUDD. I was the author of the bill which only 2 years ago transferred the Indian medical service to the Public Health Service. Of course, it takes time and extra funds to get the problem surveyed and suitable programs put into operation. There are 250 Indian tribes scattered all over the country, some in very inaccessible places, in our country and Alaska. The Public Health Service has made a fine start. I think we ought to reject this amendment and give them a chance to go ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PILLION].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PILLION) there were—ayes 49, noes 74.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. METCALF: On page 27, line 19, after "June 30, 1959:", strike out the remainder of line 19 and all of line 20 and change the semicolon to a period.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I have been disturbed, as the gentleman from Florida is disturbed, and the committee was evidently disturbed, by the failure to show more progress in the construction of Indian health facilities. When the bill offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] was passed to transfer the Indian health facilities from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to the Public Health Service it was contemplated and intended that it was to be a complete and outright transfer.

The first appropriation bill, it is true, contained the language I am seeking to strike out, namely, "Provided, That such expenditures may be made through the Department of the Interior."

I think there was a good and just cause to have that language in the appropriation bill at that time because it was necessary then to use the facilities, the knowledge and the experience of the Department of the Interior.

But, I am told now that that language, which is permissive, which says "may," which permits the Public Health Service to take advantage and to use the experience and the knowledge and the background of the Department of the Interior, has been construed as mandatory, so that instead of 1 agency, the Public Health Service, operating in this field, we still have 2 agencies, the Department of

the Interior and the Public Health Service. So, I submit this amendment to make it abundantly clear that the only agency that is supposed to be in charge of the construction of Indian hospitals and these other facilities that are enumerated in this section of the act is the Public Health Service. The Department of the Interior is not to have anything to do with it; not permitted to drag its feet. We are not going to be permitted to go back to the old days when the Bureau of Indian Affairs had control over the Indian health service, and we are going to remedy the situation just as we tried to do under the Judd bill. That is the only purpose of the amendment. And, I still believe that if the Public Health Service does need advice and consultation with the Department of the Interior, without such language they would have that opportunity.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. This proviso was put in for the specific purpose of allowing this work to continue in the most expeditious manner, and we were convinced by the administration that as long as this office in the Department of the Interior had their own group set up there, it might be well for them to administer it. And, we considered it as permissive when we said "may." Now, it is the Budget Bureau, as I understand, that has said no, the Department of the Interior should perform this work, because they have the personnel and they have the know-how and they are the ones that have been handling this type of work. And, certainly if there is any evidence at all that the Department of the Interior is to blame for the holding up of the construction that has been authorized in this field and there is some evidence that the Public Health Service might do it more efficiently and cheaper, why, we would have no objection to striking this proviso.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. It is my understanding that one of the purposes of including the language which is provided as a proviso is that certain types of construction, such as quarters for personnel, can be handled more economically and more expeditiously on reservation areas if it is handled through the Department of the Interior. Now, insofar as the actual hospital facilities are concerned, I share the gentleman's view that the responsibility should be isolated and centralized in the Public Health Service.

Mr. METCALF. I will say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that it was my belief that it would have been well to have the Department of the Interior consulted all along the line and that there was good reason for including this amendment, but when it is construed as mandatory language and when the Public Health Service is required, as I am told they are required, to operate the construction through the Department of the Interior—and the Department of the

Interior has many other construction facilities in addition to the construction of Indian facilities—then I believe it is time to eliminate this language and make it clear that the Public Health Service is the responsible agency and the Department of the Interior is to have nothing to do with it.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I take this time just to question the author of this amendment a moment or two further concerning this particular legislation. I am in complete agreement with the gentleman that the responsibility should be localized. You will recall that when the fight took place on the floor in connection with the bill of the gentleman from Minnesota in the first place, that one of the reasons we who opposed that legislation were doubtful about it was the division of responsibility as to the care of our Indian people.

Now that that responsibility has been definitely placed in the hands of the Public Health Service, insofar as all health matters are concerned, I certainly would not want to water down that responsibility; but if in the interest of efficiency and getting a job done, a permissive proviso within this bill would make it possible to do the job better and more quickly through certain construction activities in the Department of the Interior, then would not the gentleman agree, rather than to strike this language, it should be made clear on its face as being permissive in character?

Mr. METCALF. I do not see how it could be made any clearer. The word "may" is permissive. It is construed as being permissive. It may be that as a result of this colloquy on the floor we have made it sufficiently plain that the legislative intent is that the Public Health Service shall be in charge of the construction and the Department of the Interior consulted only when such consultation is requested.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that if the proviso is kept in the bill, we make it absolutely clear in the RECORD that the Public Health Service should have the authority to decide whether it shall expend these funds through its own agencies or through the Department of the Interior. I imagine that the present language would be interpreted in this way, since the language is permissive, that some people in the Department of the Interior would insist that certain funds must be handled through the Department of the Interior; and there would be a big hassle back and forth between the two Departments as to which should spend the funds. I think the decision as to which should spend them should be made by the Public Health Service. But wherever and whenever the Public Health Service can get health facilities for the Indians built more efficiently through the Department of the Interior, then the Public Health Service should have permission to spend them through the other Department. But the decision should be in the hands of the Public Health Service.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is exactly correct on that and if the gentleman would offer a substitute amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] adding language after the phrase "That such expenditures may be made through the Department of the Interior," "on the decision of the Public Health Service" I think we would have that taken care of and would be in a position where the Public Health Service had the responsibility but for reasons of efficiency the actual job could in some instances be done better by the Department of Interior officials.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, it is a little difficult to do this on the floor. May I ask the gentleman if he would accept as a substitute to his amendment, the insertion on line 20 before the period these words "subject to the discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare"? I do not have the amendment written out.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I am in complete accord with both the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. I would accept that or any other language which would do the same thing.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Why not handle it the same way we handled the construction program under Public Law 815? In that case we did not want the Department of Education to set up an Engineer Inspection Service, so we required that that work be done by General Services Administration. Why not let the Public Health Service have the administration of it but require that the engineering and inspection work be done by the General Services Administration? It worked fine in the case of Public Law 815.

Mr. JUDD. With reference to the question of how and by whom the expenditures are to be made, I think if we make that subject to the discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, there will be no question of where the jurisdiction lies.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield to me further?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I would suggest to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD] that my amendment is to strike that language. I would suggest that perhaps he could add a perfecting amendment to the paragraph, rather than offering a substitute to my amendment.

Mr. JUDD. My substitute would leave the proviso in the bill and add to it "at the discretion of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare." If it is better to offer a perfecting amendment, we will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.



Mr. Chairman, it has been said that lawyers are individuals who do not render any worthwhile service in the House. I have heard that argued at times. But look at page 27, lines 19 and 20 of the bill and then see if you can remember what this amendment is. It is to strike out "Provided, That such expenditures may be made through the Department of the Interior." See that word "may"? Do Members know what it means? May I ask the gentleman who has charge of the bill, Does he accept this amendment? Did I correctly understand that he did?

Mr. FOGARTY. I did not say we accepted or rejected it. I said that as far as I was concerned if it was determined to be the more efficient way of operating this program it would be O. K. with us, because we were not responsible for this being pushed into the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is not this the situation, that at some time in the past the Congress thought that Interior might be helpful to Public Health?

Mr. FOGARTY. In the construction of these works? Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. FOGARTY. We allowed it. We thought this language to be permissive, but the Bureau of the Budget has said it is not permissive. They have determined that the Department of the Interior should do this work.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the budget says "may" means "shall," then the individual who so decided is overeducated or should be sent back to the little red schoolhouse. But the responsibility for this program now under discussion rests with Public Health?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. All the language in the bill does is say that if Health wants to use Interior because Health thinks Interior may do a better job, it may?

Mr. FOGARTY. Interior already has the job to do this construction work where they have the personnel set up. I understand that was the reason behind the Bureau of the Budget's thinking it could be done more efficiently, because they had the setup to do it.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. That is exactly the point I was making, that I thought, as the rest of the Members of the Congress thought, that it would be well to use the facilities of the Department of the Interior; but if this is mandatory and it is necessary to use the facilities, then our attempt to transfer the Indian Health Service to the Public Health Service has just resulted in the creation of two bureaus.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If the amendment the gentleman offered is adopted, then Health cannot use Interior, can it?

Mr. METCALF. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You see where you are getting? You force Health to do the work even though Interior can do it better and at less cost.

Mr. METCALF. I understand that the gentleman from Minnesota has a substitute amendment that would do the

same thing. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOFFMAN. To put that other one in?

Mr. METCALF. To withdraw my amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And take the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. METCALF. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I cannot yield for that. That would not help us. What is the idea, may I ask the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; it does help.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The very distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. JUDD, knows what "may" means, does he not? The word is permissive, is it not?

Mr. JUDD. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then the gentleman believes that Health should have something to say about it, does he not?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota wants construction to be under the direction of Public Health Service?

Mr. JUDD. That is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the gentleman from Minnesota is in favor of permitting Interior when requested by Health to help out?

Mr. JUDD. That is exactly right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what this language does now in the bill says and does. How silly can we get?

Mr. JUDD. The gentleman is perfectly right that this language in the bill does not do what we want. That is why I offered a suggestion that would correct it. The gentleman from Wisconsin will now offer it formally in writing.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not yield any more. Just how many words does it take to make "may" permissive? "You may."

Mr. JUDD. But who is to determine that he may?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Beyond any doubt or question Health does.

When an amendment is necessary to define the three letter word "may" as meaning permissive I give up. One would think we were being paid by the word.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. A substitute is not in order to a motion to strike out. The gentleman can offer a perfecting amendment to the paragraph.

Mr. LAIRD. That is what I should offer, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the paragraph offered by Mr. LAIRD: On page 27, line 20, after "Interior", insert "at the option of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is clarify what the committee thought the language meant in this bill. This same language was car-

ried in this appropriation bill last year and the word "may" was not intended to be mandatory language.

The Bureau of the Budget's ruling is hard to understand. I cannot understand how the sentence referred to by the gentleman from Montana, can be construed as mandatory language.

I think we all agree that the responsibility for this program should rest squarely on the shoulders of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. For that reason, I believe this amendment will clearly place the responsibility with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, but will give the authority to the Secretary to use services of certain personnel, if necessary, in the Department of the Interior. That is what our committee was trying to do in carrying this language forward in this appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Does that mean an expansion of the personnel?

Mr. LAIRD. It does not mean any expansion. This language was carried in the bill last year. The word "may" was interpreted by our committee to give permissive authority. Certainly, we had always assumed, and I am sure the gentleman would assume, that the word "may" would give permissive authority.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman does not think that due to this authority there will be any expansion?

Mr. LAIRD. No. I would not offer this amendment if it meant any expansion of personnel. This places the authority in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare where it should be.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. JUDD. What the gentleman's amendment does is end the existing division of authority; is that not correct?

Mr. LAIRD. That is correct.

Mr. JUDD. The purpose of it is to make clear that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is the one who will be making the permissive decisions.

Mr. LAIRD. The Secretary will have the responsibility.

Mr. JUDD. That is right. He can permit, whenever it is to his advantage and the advantage of the Indians to do it through the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa insist upon the point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be read again; was that an amendment to the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is a perfecting amendment to the paragraph.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to the paragraph offered by Mr. LAIRD: On page 27, line 20, after the word "Interior", insert "at the option of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the committee is willing to accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Institutes of Health, general research and services: For the activities of the National Institutes of Health, not otherwise provided for, including research fellowships and grants for research projects pursuant to section 301 of the act; regulation and preparation of biologic products, and conduct of research related thereto; not to exceed \$2,500 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General; erection of temporary structures; and grants of therapeutic and chemical substances for demonstrations and research; \$14,026,000: *Provided*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to advance to this appropriation from other appropriations to the Public Health Service such amounts as are determined to be necessary for the foregoing purposes and for activities performed on a centralized basis: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to operate the facilities at the National Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and others at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to this appropriation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language beginning on page 28. No, Mr. Chairman, I think we are on page 21 now.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Permit the Chair to state that if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is referring to page 28, the Clerk has read page 28 down to and including line 15.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the point of order I wish to make is against the language beginning on line 6 down to and including line 10 except the word "Provided." I make the point of order against the language on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill in that it requires additional services to be rendered by the Surgeon General.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman withhold his point of order until we see what this amendment does?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have no objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan reserves the point of order.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, the reason for this being in the bill is that all of the categorical institutes that we have such as cancer, mental health, heart, arthritis, allergy, neurology and so on, get their appropriations by virtue of this language, and if this language is stricken out, it is going to make it more inefficient in the operation of the institutes. The only reason the language was put in there in the first place is to have a more efficient operation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. Does the gentleman from Michigan want to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan makes a point of order against the language contained on page 28 of the bill beginning in line 6 and continuing through line 10. The Chair has examined the language and finds that this is purely legislation on an appropriation bill and, therefore, must sustain the point of order.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the same point of order against the language on page 28 of the bill beginning in line 10 and continuing through the balance of the paragraph, and reading as follows:

*Provided further*, That the Surgeon General is authorized to operate facilities at the National Institutes of Health for the sale of meals to employees and others at rates determined by him to be sufficient to recover the cost of such operation and the proceeds thereof shall be credited to this appropriation.

The argument is the same, that the Surgeon General is required to enter into other and additional activities. He is required by that language to operate a cafeteria or restaurant.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. The only reason I can give in respect to this language is the same as that already given, that this permits the Institutes of Health to run a cafeteria and to be reimbursed for the cost of running it.

Striking out this amendment will only increase the cost. The gentleman by making his point of order is going in reverse.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The Chair must hold that the same reasoning that applied to the previous proviso applies to this one.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because we have now reached in the bill the National Institutes of Health about which I have made previous remarks stating that when we came to that point I was going to offer some amendments. The atmosphere of the discussion which I had requested be kept on an objective plane,

has been emotional rather than objective. It is very obvious that a sensitive matter like this cannot be discussed objectively on the floor of the House at this time. I, therefore, will not offer these amendments. I wish, however, to state for the consideration of the House that the true issue was very well stated by Dr. Gerard who supported the mental health program. I refer my colleagues to page 41 of the hearings, the volume that includes the statements of Members of Congress and organizations and interested individuals. I read the following:

Dr. GERARD. What magnitude of funds could be used effectively from year to year for such a developing program is largely a guess at the present. Forced draft could result in more damage than speed; if too much money were suddenly expended, the few competent workers would be lured here and there and effective work disrupted, and many incompetent workers would enter the field and trivial investigations would clutter up space and other resources and muddy the literature. On the other hand, inadequate, uncertain, or ephemeral funds would prevent the sound buildup of personnel, program, and facilities, especially for the longer range goals indicated earlier. I am sure the Congress has reason, from past performance, to trust the National Institute of Mental Health and the Psychopharmacology Service Center and their advisers to handle with responsibility funds made available to them.

That states the issue. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON] asked us to read the testimony. I have read the testimony, and what alarms me is that the basic issue that ought to be considered objectively was not discussed by the witnesses in the hearings. This is not a question of who is for or against cancer, heart disease, or any of these other crippling diseases. It should be unnecessary to say that, of course, we are all against these social evils. It is a question of how we should go about combating these diseases. What is to be the relationship and balance between private enterprise, the State and local programs, and the Federal program? What are the Federal programs to be? Indeed, we can damage this program if we go about it in a blind way and on an appeal solely to emotion. As a matter of fact, last year it was very obvious that we went too fast. We doubled the amount available in these programs in 1957 over 1956. This was \$50 million more than the administration recommended. The planning was considerably behind the appropriation. Ten million dollars of the appropriation will be turned back as unobligated and unexpended this June 30. That is the kind of procedure that can damage these programs we say we are for. If we really wish to further these programs we must consider them carefully.

My hope is that in the ensuing months we will start thinking about these matters objectively. Members should be able to come down here on the floor of the House to discuss the details and get into the meat of these programs without being accused of trying to wreck the program or of not being interested in it. The hearings should go into the details of the programs instead of merely setting forth generalities, which may or may not be well founded.



Finally, let me say that every one of these are open-end programs. They are authorized and there is no limit to where they can go except by appropriations. We see an example on page 44 of how far we have gone:

Mr. FOGARTY. Doctor, what about the advisability of a rabbi, a minister, or a priest receiving some psychiatric training? Are we doing more of that than we used to?

Dr. BRACELAND. Very much. There is an academy now dealing in psychiatry. It has a full-time secretary in the office and men from all denominations are in there. They have received funds.

It could be argued that might be a meritorious program, but that should not be decided by the Appropriations Committee. Those matters are all matters to be decided by legislative committees to see where and how far we are going with these programs and how we can keep our Federal programs in proper balance with private enterprise and local governments. If we do not start thinking along these lines pretty soon, we will badly damage these overall programs.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I disagree thoroughly with the gentleman from Missouri. My only regret is we do not have more money in the National Institutes of Health than we have this year. I think if we did have we could spend it wisely and expeditiously and we could do a much better job with it and save many lives.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Why then in the hearings did not the gentleman and his committee go into these details so that a person reading the hearings could find out what was being done in private work compared with the Government, what the ratio is, for example, what is being done here and what is being done there? You can read all of the testimony and all there is to it is a lot of fine generalities which we all agree with but none of the details of the programs are set forth, for instance as to what the Federal Government is doing and what is being done locally in the schools, and so forth.

Mr. FOGARTY. Maybe there is not as much detail as the gentleman would like, but if he would go back 10 years and read the history of these appropriations, he would have every detail he wanted.

We did not arrive at these figures on the basis of testimony of just so-called bureaucrats in Government. We brought in some of the best doctors in the world. If the gentleman can bring in any doctor who will refute anything that has been said, or quote some doctor friend of his that has more knowledge on these subjects than we have, I welcome the gentleman to appear before our committee.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I can assure the gentleman I will be before the committee next year. Let me say this: The doctors are very fine men, but the statements of those doctors deal only in what we might term as glittering generalities.

Mr. FOGARTY. I disagree with the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is my conclusion. Of course, the gentleman can disagree. I want to say that this is a field in which I am not completely inexperienced. It is a field with which I am deeply concerned. My information does not rest on what is in the hearings. But there is only one way we are going to have these programs. I know the gentleman is sincerely interested in them, but we have to go into them objectively and remove the emotional talk that goes with this and grant to those who disagree with the gentleman a hearing. They are also interested.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not think the gentleman can charge any of us with emotionalism. We are out trying to provide funds for research that will save lives and help persons who are afflicted with physical problems. As an example, I should like to take a few minutes to discuss one of the most serious public-health problems facing America today. I refer specifically to the problem of hearing disorders and to the lack of adequate research efforts to cope with it.

Today there are an estimated 15 million Americans—men, women, and children—with some sort of hearing defect. Of this number, about 4 million are seriously handicapped and about 170,000 are totally deaf. In short, there are more Americans with hearing defects than there are with virtually any other type of disorder to which man is exposed.

What are we doing about this terrible problem? Very, very little. We have, in fact, barely begun to develop the knowledge and techniques we must have if we are to understand the nature and causes of deafness and if we are to develop truly effective preventive measures and treatments.

Granted, a good deal is being accomplished through the nationwide rehabilitation program. Progress is being made to restore many of those with hearing disabilities to productive lives and I think there will be even greater progress as the rehabilitation effort gains momentum.

But this does not begin to take the measure of the hearing problem in America. It does not begin to reduce the social and economic strain focused upon the hundreds of thousands of people with severe hearing loss. It does not make jobs for many who could hold them if some way could be found to compensate for deafness—some way which was consistent with their skills as well as with the needs of the prospective employer.

And, most certainly, the rehabilitation effort—as fine as it is—is not the answer to the hearing problems which will confront the generations of the future.

No, the basic, long-range answer to the hearing problem lies in better understanding of the nature and causes of deafness and in the development of means of effectively treating or preventing hearing defects. And this is a matter for medical research.

Most of us here are well aware that the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness in Bethesda, Md., is conducting a broad-based research at-

tack against the neurological and sensory diseases. The Institute's program has been in full operation for only 3 years and many advances have been made against the major neurological maimers and killers in that time. But 3 years is not a very long time and there are some disorders of the senses in which research efforts are just getting under way.

Hearing research is one of these areas in which very little has been done. This applies not only to the Institute but to research organizations throughout the country. The Institute has made some modest beginnings during the current fiscal year. Something in excess of \$400,000 has been awarded for hearing research grants and, as of February, three grants had been made for the training of hearing researchers.

But, as I have said, this is only a beginning. In light of the tremendous problem posed by hearing defects, the time has come to develop a full-fledged, coordinated program in hearing research. The time has come to devote enough money to meet and solve a problem whose cost cannot begin to be measured in human, social and economic terms.

Consider, if you will, some of the many gaps in hearing research—the research areas in which little or nothing has been done. There is a vital need to study and understand the nerve system that connects the hearing organ and the brain. We do not, in fact, know what the specific function of the brain is in the hearing process and—only in the past year—research at the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness has shown that the brain's role in that process is very different from what most of us had been led to believe over the past 20 years.

Another area of hearing research which had been greatly neglected had to do with the development of new electronic techniques for analysis of the hearing system. Still other neglected areas involve the relationship between deafness and psychological factors, the neurological aspects of deafness, the effect of noise upon the hearing process and the evaluation of surgery as a means of coping with hearing disorders.

There are many other gap areas as well but these, I think, illustrate all too clearly the scope of the hearing problem and of the research required to meet it. Clearly, however, we cannot separate the research effort from the skilled manpower needed to carry it forward. There is a pressing need for both investigators and for teachers in the hearing field.

There is a need to develop and support well-rounded graduate teaching programs. There is a need to further pursue our evaluation of training resources in this country and to encourage their development and expansion. There is a vital need for more fellowships and traineeships at the graduate level—for funds which would give us more research specialists in hearing as rapidly as possible.

Are we to stand idly by amidst 15 million Americans with hearing defects, amidst 4 million with severe hearing handicaps? Can we afford to be penny wise and dollar foolish? Are we to be

satisfied with cutting costs even if it means relegating the productive capacity of millions of our fellow citizens to the occupational dust heap? Are we, then, at the point where we can justify a failure to appropriate adequate funds with no reference to what the failure will cost in human and social terms?

I say the answer is "No." I say that, both as legislators devoted to our country and as human beings devoted to the welfare of our people, we have no recourse but to do something about this hearing problem and to do it now.

Today, the facilities stand ready in many parts of the country to do the research demanded by the hearing problem. Given the kind of support which only the Congress can give, these facilities will do this research, and many others will shortly join them.

Today, the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness has the basic facilities to take on the kind of expanded hearing research program which both conscience and necessity demand of us. Given the proper support, the Institute, I am sure, will not only develop the kind of program we need but will also serve—through its grants-in-aid program—as a coordinating influence which will bring research organizations throughout the country into the hearing research fold. And, I might add, that this would be done in a manner fully consistent with the freedom of investigation of both the cooperating institutions and of the individual researchers.

Today, there are a half dozen educational institutions equipped to take on the full-time training of research investigators and teachers in the hearing field. I think it is safe to say that the list would double in a matter of months given the necessary grant-in-aid support.

I think the case for a well-rounded hearing research program speaks for itself. I know that we owe it to ourselves, to our country, and to our fellow Americans with and without hearing handicaps to make that program a reality at the earliest possible time. That is why I have taken steps this year to start some form of action to assist these people who are in need of our help. With the cooperation of the committee we have appropriated \$620,000 this year to make a start on such a program.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. WOLVERTON. The most encouraging thing that I have heard here during these days of debate is the statement that was just made by the gentleman from Missouri when he addressed the House in which he said that although he had previously indicated that he would introduce amendments with respect to these important research activities of the Department of Health, upon further consideration he had come to the conclusion that he would not do so. This will enable the appropriations in the bill to stand as they are. Now, I do not wish to get into any argument with him for fear that he may change his mind. I am perfectly satisfied to let it stay

right where it is. I think he has shown unusually good judgment in the statement that he has made to the committee, and I am inclined to think that when the roll call is held in the House on some of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole House there will be others like him who will feel that it is best for them to change their minds and vote against the amendments. Now, I do commend him for the statement that he has made not only in not moving the amendments but that he will give the matter further study, and I certainly hope that those who have been voting in a way that has indicated to me that they had not given very great study to this matter will follow his leadership and give the matter the further study that the importance of it entitles it to have.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. On page 28, lines 2 and 3, "not to exceed \$2,500 for entertainment of visiting scientists when specifically approved by the Surgeon General."

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late. There has been a great deal of debate on the rest of the paragraph.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, like a good many of my colleagues, I have listened patiently throughout this debate which has created far more heat than logic, which I regret very much. Most of the talk has appealed to the emotions and the excitement of the Members.

Yesterday we heard this from the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. He said:

If you have a child 10 years old today and you have another child born tomorrow, that child born tomorrow is expected to live 10 years longer than the 10-year-old child today.

Now, surely he did not mean that because the son was born 10 years later that he was expected to live 10 years longer. He wanted us to believe that in the last 10 years we had added to the expectancy of life 10 years.

So, I called up the actuary at the social security to find out the facts, and here are the facts. In 1929 the expectancy was 57.1 years; in 1944 it was 65.2; in 1954 it was 69.6 years. In other words, in 25 years we have added 12.5 years to the life expectancy. In the last 10 years we have added a little over 4 years in life expectancy.

Again the other day in the debate on one of these items the distinguished chairman, in regard to the category allergy, said that these two Institutes expended all of their funds. I called the Bureau of the Budget to find out about that case. In 1936 they spent \$7,575,000. In 1957, the current fiscal year, the appropriation was \$13,299,000. The Bureau of the Budget informed me that there is \$400,000 in that account which cannot be expended this year. The new appropriation is \$17,400,000 and of that amount \$1,400,000 cannot be used. They do not need the \$1,400,000 and the Bureau of the Budget informs me that they

could not use it. I was going to offer an amendment to this item on allergy, but there is no use of doing so, because all one receives when he tries to suggest anything here is a threat of a rollcall. Mr. Chairman, let me say this: I would not ask any bureau or any agency of this Government to tighten its belt any more than I would be willing to tighten my own as a Congressman. And I hope that when the legislative appropriation bill comes before us we will have the good judgment to cut the fat out of that bill. I would also like to see a rollcall on the question of our new office building, on which I personally never had an opportunity to vote.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNGER. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know where the gentleman got his information, but he, or someone he is quoting, certainly misrepresented the facts. As far as the National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases is concerned, if he got them from the Bureau of the Budget, they did not give him the correct figures, because by the end of this year that Institute will have no unobligated balances. They already have more applications for research grants than they have money to cover. Furthermore, I am amazed that the Bureau of the Budget now states that \$1,400,000 of the amount approved by them and sent to the Congress cannot be used. How can they know at this time what applications will be received or approved in 1958?

Mr. YOUNGER. I got these figures from the assistant in Mr. Merriam's office.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not care where the gentleman got them. The fact is that in that particular Institute they have more applications approved for research this year than they have money for. That is one of the Institutes that ran out of money as far as applications are concerned.

Mr. YOUNGER. I shall have these figures confirmed and bring them back here tomorrow.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman may quote me and tell his informant that I say that he does not know what he is talking about as far as unobligated balances are concerned at the end of this fiscal year.

The Clerk read as follows:

National Cancer Institute: To enable the Surgeon General, upon the recommendations of the National Advisory Cancer Council, to make grants-in-aid for research and training projects relating to cancer; to cooperate with State health agencies, and other public and private nonprofit institutions, in the prevention, control, and eradication of cancer by providing constructive services, demonstrations, and grants-in-aid; and to contract for supplies and services by negotiation, without regard to section 3709 of the revised statutes, in connection with the chemotherapy program; and to otherwise carry out the provisions of title IV, part A, of the act; \$46,902,000.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I listened very intently to the gentleman's discussion here a moment ago about examin-



ing everything closely, screening carefully all items in this health welfare bill. However, let me call to the attention of the committee that just a few weeks ago in this House almost everybody voted for \$200 million for the Middle East. Nobody even questioned it to any extent. Nobody knew what it was for or where or how it was going to be spent, other than just it was for \$200 million. But what concerns me is the fact that the Members are getting a bit extreme about every little item here which concerns the national health and welfare of our own people, our own folks, right here in our own backyards.

There was no hesitancy at all in voting \$200 million for the Middle East, and I doubt if there will be any prolonged debate on the \$4,400,000 for foreign aid. I sincerely hope that the \$4 billion foreign-aid bill will be as carefully scrutinized as this bill we have before us today.

The Clerk read as follows:

Neurology and blindness activities: For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the act relating to neurology and blindness, \$18,887,000.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, there are more than 4 million Americans—men, women, and children—who are mentally retarded. An estimated million and a half of our countrymen are afflicted by epilepsy. More than 2 million are the victims of crippling cerebral palsy.

It is true that many of those so afflicted have been helped to become productive human beings through modern rehabilitation methods. It is true that rehabilitation has opened the way to a decent life for many of our handicapped people even as it has added to the economic and social potential of the Nation as a whole. I think that all of us here would agree that the progress in this respect has been most heartening.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are well advised to remember that the ultimate answer to the problem posed by cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, mental retardation, epilepsy, and similar conditions lies in medical research. The answer lies in better understanding of the nature and causes of these disorders and in the development of fully effective preventives and cures.

We owe it to those afflicted, to the Nation, and—yes, to ourselves—to foster the finding of that answer at the earliest possible time. For the tragedy of these diseases is beyond measurement in social and human terms if, indeed, it can be measured at all. And the cost in terms of wasted resources and productive potential is tremendous.

Fortunately, there is a program now underway which may well bring the prevention or more effective treatment of mental retardation, cerebral palsy, and allied diseases a generation closer to realization if we but give it our support. I refer to the nationwide collaborative investigation being carried on under the

auspices of the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness of the National Institutes of Health.

There are now some nine medical institutions cooperating with the institute in this great research effort which—when in full swing—will bring about 150,000 women and babies under study. The investigation is designed to find out everything possible about what goes on in that crucial period from roughly 1 month after a baby is conceived to about 1 month after it is born. The doctors have a term for this span of time. They call it the perinatal period.

Today we know that diseases like cerebral palsy and mental retardation generally have their beginnings in the perinatal period. We know that a wide variety of deadly factors—factors like lack of oxygen, injury at birth, diseases in the mother—play a role in causing these crippling diseases.

But we do not know exactly what this role is. We do not know exactly how and why these influences bring on any given neurological disorder. We do not know their relative importance as causative agents. And we cannot hope for prevention or cure until we know these things.

Mr. Chairman, if we are to find the basic answers we seek, if we are to wipe out these terrible blights upon humanity, we must support the medical-research program dedicated to these ends. We must support broad-scale collaborative investigations like that directed to the perinatal period. These men of science deserve our every consideration so their great work can go forward.

Mr. Chairman, we must pay a reasonable price for the health and welfare of the American people. The funds requested for medical research in the bill now before this committee are well within the rule of reason.

The Clerk read as follows:

Retired pay of commissioned officers: For retired pay of commissioned officers, as authorized by law, and payments under the Uniformed Services Contingency Option Act of 1953, such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that paragraph beginning at line 9 and running down to line 13. The paragraph does not carry any amount at all. I would have no objection to the paragraph if it did, but it states "such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year." It stops there, so it requires someone in the Government somewhere along the line to make an investigation and determine what amount is necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. These funds are authorized in the basic law to be appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to have the gentleman from Rhode Island clear up the meaning of that line 12, beginning with the words "such amount as may be required during the current fiscal year." Just what does that mean?

Mr. FOGARTY. As far as the retirement pay of commissioned officers is concerned, the retirement pay is fixed by law. When they reach the retirement age we are obligated to pay them retirement at that age, and it is an indefinite appropriation for that purpose. The basic law spells out how old an officer has to be, and with how many years of service. When he reaches that age and has the required number of years of service we are obligated to pay that amount. It does not make any difference how many men there are who reach the retirement age in one certain year, we have to pay that amount whatever it may be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

In the opinion of the Chair, no fixed amount being set out in the bill, this is purely legislative language calling upon someone to do something before this money is paid. The Chair therefore must sustain the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For the divisions and offices of the Office of the Surgeon General and for miscellaneous expenses of the Public Health Service not appropriated for elsewhere, including preparing information, articles, and publications related to public health; and conducting studies and demonstrations in public health methods; \$5,100,000.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this simply for the purpose of placing in the Record at this point an explanation of the cut that was made in the appropriation for the Bureau of Employment Security in the Department of Labor Wednesday March 27, page 6, line 5 of the bill. Many of the Members have asked that an explanation of what that cut amounted to be placed in the Record so that they could read it. Being a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, from which this particular legislation came, I am placing this explanation in the Record at this point for anyone to read.

Mr. Chairman, for the record and in the interest of making the truth available to the American people I feel constrained to factually refer to an action taken by this distinguished committee on March 27, 1957, during its deliberations on H. R. 6287, the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I will make specific reference to the portion of the bill beginning on page 5 providing funds for the Bureau of Employment Security in the Department of Labor.

Before beginning my discussion of the committee action it might be well to briefly recall how the unemployment compensation program operates. The Federal unemployment tax is a 3 percent tax levied upon payrolls of employers of 4 or more workers during 20 weeks in a year in all but certain specified categories of employment. The tax is applicable to the first \$3,000 of annual income of workers. The employer is permitted to offset up to 90 percent of the Federal tax—2.7 percent of taxable payrolls—with State unemployment insurance taxes and is also permitted to

include in the offset any State tax savings that are allowed him under the law of his State. Generally speaking this means that the proceeds of the Federal Government amount to 10 percent of the 3 percent unemployment tax or 0.3 percent of taxable payrolls. The Federal collections from this tax are used to defray Federal and State administrative expenses, and to maintain a \$200 million revolving fund used as a loan fund to assist States having insufficient funds for maintaining the State unemployment-compensation program. Excess collections not necessary for the operation of these Federal functions are returned on a pro rata basis to the States.

Against that background let us examine the effect of an amendment adopted by this committee on March 27, 1957, to H. R. 6287 whereby an amount of \$262 million that was set forth on page 6, line 5 of the bill, was reduced to \$249,814,000. This amount provided grants to States for unemployment compensation and employment service administration. It should be stressed that these funds relate only to administrative costs of the program and do not affect the funds available for benefit purposes.

The administration had requested \$270 million for this function and the House Appropriation Committee had reduced that amount to \$262 million as indicated in the bill as reported by that committee. The action taken in this body on March 27 to reduce the appropriation to an amount slightly under \$250 million would have the effect of making available to the Bureau of Employment Security approximately the same amount of funds that was available with respect to fiscal year 1957.

It should be realized that the money appropriated for this purpose comes from the Federal unemployment account and that all the money paid into the Federal unemployment account from the Federal 3-percent tax is used exclusively for the unemployment-insurance program. As I have previously explained, excess collections under this tax are returned to the States and the States use such refunds either for the payment of unemployment insurance benefits, for the strengthening of the State unemployment insurance fund, or for State expenses in administering the program. Therefore, it is apparent that charges made to the effect that the action by this body in reducing the funds available for grants to the States to slightly under \$250 million will jeopardize the payment of unemployment compensation benefits cannot be sustained by an examination of the true facts.

Instead of weakening the program, Mr. Chairman, I suggest this action will actually strengthen the State operation of the respective State unemployment insurance programs. The States will receive larger pro rata refunds and the States will have the authority to determine whether such refunds shall be used for benefit purposes or for administration purposes rather than have the Federal Government impose on the States an obligation to spend more solely for administration.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the record the Congress has made in strength-

ening the Federal unemployment insurance laws since I have been privileged to serve in the House of Representatives. That record may be summarized to include, first, improved fiscal management of unemployment insurance funds; second, extension of unemployment insurance coverage to an approximate 4 million additional workers; third, improvement in the coverage accorded maritime workers; and fourth, Federal action to strengthen the operation of State unemployment insurance programs. Much of this legislation was enacted during the 83d Congress and bears the name of a distinguished Member of this body as author and principal sponsor. I refer to my distinguished committee colleague, the gentleman from New York, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED. Support for this legislation was bipartisan just as support for the amendment adopted by this body on March 27 was also bipartisan. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for taking the time of this Committee in this manner, but I thought it important that the facts be made a matter of record without distortion and without bias.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to remind the Members that on last Thursday I did place in the RECORD just exactly what this cut in the Bureau of Employment Security can mean. I also explained then that when you voted to cut these expenses you were not taking anything out of the Federal Treasury at all. You were not at all affecting the rate of taxes paid as far as Federal taxes were concerned. This money all comes out of the three-tenths of 1 percent that is paid into the fund by the employers of this country.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think when the gentleman reads my statement he will find that it accurately explains what the cut is. The gentleman can make his remarks at that time. That is why I put this explanation in the RECORD.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think we spelled out in the report what these expenditures were for. They were for that specific purpose and no other purpose, regardless of what the gentleman's explanation may be.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Anyone can read the material for himself.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### ST. ELIZABETHS HOSPITAL

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of the hospital, including clothing for patients, and cooperation with organizations or individuals in the scientific research into the nature, causes, prevention and treatment of mental illness, \$3 million.

Major repairs and preservation of buildings and grounds: For miscellaneous construction, alterations, repairs, and equipment, on the grounds of the hospital, including preparation of plans and specifications, advertising, and supervision of construction \$55,000, to remain available until June 30, 1959: *Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 31, line 8, after "1959" strike the remainder of line 8 and line 9.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, permit me to ask the chairman of the committee who has charge of the bill: What that last sentence, "*Provided*, That any part of this amount may be transferred to the General Services Administration" means. What was the purpose of that please?

Mr. FOGARTY. This is the same proviso that is in other sections of the bill where the General Services Administration is charged with the responsibility of the construction of Federal buildings. We just transfer to them money out of these funds to reimburse them for the architects and for the work of inspection and other work that goes into the building of these buildings. It is just a reimbursement of these funds to the General Services Administration for the work they perform for this particular agency.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Grants to States for public assistance: For grants to States for old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, and aid to the permanently and totally disabled, as authorized in titles I, IV, X, and XIV of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C., ch. 7, subchs. I, IV, X, and XIV), \$1,600,000,000, of which such amount as may be necessary shall be available for grants for any period in the prior fiscal year subsequent to March 31 of that year: *Provided*, That not more than \$104,000,000 of the amount herein appropriated shall be used for expenses of State and local administration: *Provided further*, That none of the amount herein appropriated shall be used to cover any costs of State and local administration incurred prior to July 1, 1957.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from North Carolina rise?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Idaho rise?

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina has just been recognized to offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COOLEY: On page 32, after line 21, insert the following paragraph: "Grants to States for training public-welfare personnel: For grants to States for increasing the number of adequately trained public-welfare personnel available for work in the public-assistance programs as authorized by section 705 of the Social Security Act, as amended, \$2,500,000."



Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order. I believe that section was passed, but I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. It was not passed. My amendment was at the Clerk's desk, but the Clerk was reading so rapidly that he passed that section inadvertently.

Mr. MORANO. The Clerk had already read the item of salaries and expenses, Bureau of Public Assistance, \$2 million.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, it would be very unfortunate if this amendment were defeated because of some technicality or because of a point of order.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, I reserved the point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. I understand the gentleman has reserved the point of order. Actually, this Congress authorized this program. This program came from the Committee on Ways and Means. I feel quite certain that that great committee gave careful consideration to the program before it was approved. This House has authorized \$5 million to carry on the work. The administration has been very modest and reasonable in its request. The request was for only \$2,500,000. Unfortunately, the Committee on Appropriations struck out the item and the only explanation that is given is as follows:

Grants to States for training public welfare personnel: The request for \$2,500,000 to start this proposed new program has been disallowed.

There is no explanation as to why the Committee on Appropriations has taken upon itself the right and the authority to veto an act of Congress.

This was an act of both Houses of Congress, and I maintain that however much you might want to curtail the budget and however much you might be in favor of economy, that to eliminate this item would be false economy.

I do not believe that we should permit the Appropriations Committee to veto the action of the Ways and Means Committee and, likewise, the act of Congress through which we sought to start this training program.

The program contemplates a Federal payment of 80 percent of the training program with the other 20 percent being paid by the several States. My State of North Carolina happens to be prepared to go forward with the training program, and I am making an effort to have this item inserted in the bill knowing full well, of course, that it will increase by \$2,500,000 the amount provided in the overall measure.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. This would not increase the original budget estimates.

Mr. COOLEY. No, no.

Mr. FOGARTY. Because we as a subcommittee would like to have had this \$2,500,000. It was cut out in the full committee.

Mr. COOLEY. I do not mean to say that it would be an increase.

Mr. FOGARTY. I, as chairman, believed that this was necessary, and also

the item for cooperative research; and it was on that basis that we cut public assistance down to some extent because we thought that this \$2,500,000 would provide for sufficient operation of these programs.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman for his observations. Actually the amount I am trying to put into this bill now is only half the amount authorized.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Is the gentleman sure this authorization bill was passed by the House Ways and Means Committee or was it tacked onto some measure passed by the other body?

Mr. COOLEY. I am assuming that it came from the Ways and Means Committee. Actually my recollection is, and I checked it with the clerk of the committee, the item was probably inserted in the Senate, was taken to conference, brought back to the House and approved by both the House and the Senate. Now the Appropriations Committee because of this urgent need to cut the budget has eliminated it entirely without any explanation.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman will agree that it did not originate with the House Ways and Means Committee but was tacked on by the other body.

Mr. COOLEY. I am perfectly willing to admit that it did not, but, after all, it was the function of the Ways and Means Committee and it was approved by the Members of this House; and I do not recall that the gentleman who is now interrogating me objected to it at that time. I knew what I was doing at the time when I voted for it; and I know what I am doing now in trying to reinstate it. Because administrative costs have mounted unduly. Some States that have operated with thrift and economy are being penalized, and unless we change the situation my own State of North Carolina in the months of May and June will suffer a reduction in administrative costs of about 36 percent.

Under the Social Security Act amendment of 1956, an annual appropriation for grants to States for training public welfare personnel was authorized for a period of 5 years, effective as of July 1, 1957. The administration recommended an appropriation of only \$2,500,000 for the initial year of operation indicating that a substantial start toward increasing the number of adequately trained personnel could be made with the expenditure of this amount of money.

The law authorizes grants-in-aid to be made to each State under an allotment formula based on population; financial need; and the relative need for trained public welfare personnel, particularly for personnel to provide self-support and self-care services. The extent to which funds would be used by the agencies of the several States would, of course, depend upon the need for trained personnel in the States and subdivisions. The purpose of the whole program, as I understand it, is to provide the skilled workers and the help needed to enable recipients to make the greatest possible use of his own capabilities and capaci-

ties, and to achieve independent living, personal pride, and respectability. Public assistance personnel are responsible for dealing with approximately 5 million needy persons, many of whom have serious individual and family problems. The Federal Government would provide 80 percent; the States and local subdivisions would provide the additional 20 percent of the cost, for traineeships and fellowships to persons employed or preparing for employment, with public assistance agencies; for special courses of study or seminars of short duration; or for teaching grants to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning.

The administration indicated in the recommendation the great need for trained welfare personnel. The request was reasonable and modest, but for some unexplained reason the committee disallowed the item.

I desire to reiterate the statements I have heretofore made. I am definitely in favor of eliminating unnecessary Federal expenditures. I am in favor of reducing the gigantic budget. I am in favor of economy, but I am not in favor of false economy. I believe that this \$2,500,000 could be and indeed will be, if provided, a real investment in the welfare of people and ultimately a wise investment of Federal funds, an investment which will return great human and economic profits. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate and commend the distinguished and honorable gentleman from Rhode Island, our colleague, JOHN FOGARTY, for the splendid manner in which he has handled this rather complex and controversial measure. He has done a magnificent job. Although he has met with formidable and stubborn opposition, he has not weakened nor has he once lowered his arm in his great fight in behalf of the very worthwhile programs which are provided for in this appropriation bill. He is worthy of his chairmanship, and he deserves the gratitude of every Member of this House.

Frankly, I have not been encouraged to believe that the amendment which I have offered would escape the formidable opposition and the zealous efforts which are being made to cut indiscriminately appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. I urge you, however, to consider seriously the amendment which I have offered, and I hope that it will be approved and accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. COOLEY. I urge the adoption of the amendment, the objection notwithstanding.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not in order at this point in the bill, the Clerk having read down to line 2 on page 33; and, furthermore, that it is not authorized by law.

Mr. COOLEY. May I be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. COOLEY. Do I understand the gentleman to base his point of order upon the ground that this amount was not authorized by law?

Mr. TABER. Upon the ground that the amendment is not in order at the point where the Clerk had finished reading.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on that point. The gentleman from North Carolina was on his feet while the Clerk was reading. The Clerk continued to read before the gentleman had a chance to offer his amendment.

The gentleman was entitled to recognition.

The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COOLEY) there were—ayes 21, noes 88.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to announce for the benefit of the members of the committee that it is our intention, now that we have reached this point in the bill and there are only 2 or 3 more amendments to be offered, to finish reading the bill tonight, then I understand there will be an attempt made to meet early tomorrow and complete all rollcalls tomorrow.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BUDGE: On line 33, line 2, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,900,000."

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Island and I have disagreed at various points throughout this bill but I hope that he will be in agreement with me on this amendment which relates to additional salaries to carry out the program on which the Committee of the Whole House just voted. As near as I can determine, there are about \$100,000 in salaries carried for the Bureau of Public Assistance to carry out this program of training welfare personnel. That program was just defeated on a division vote. I would hope that the gentleman from Rhode Island will accept this amendment. It certainly should be adopted in view of the fact that the program for which the expenditure was to be made and for which the salaries were to be paid is not carried in the appropriation bill.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. It is my understanding only \$99 million have been made available and that they need \$105 million. Unless we provide the money we will not be keeping faith with the several States; is that not true?

Mr. BUDGE. That, of course, would not apply to the amendment which I have offered, I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought the gentleman's amendment was to put in this bill the amount that is short in the other bill?

Mr. BUDGE. No, that is not correct. The amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina would have restored \$2½ million for the training of personnel.

Mr. COOLEY. I know that.

Mr. BUDGE. There is now in the amendment which I have offered \$100,000 which is carried in the bill and should not be in the bill because it is to pay the salaries of the people who were to set up this training program to which the gentleman referred.

Mr. COOLEY. One hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. BUDGE. One hundred thousand dollars and the bill should be reduced by that amount because the purpose for which the \$100,000 is in there was eliminated by the Appropriations Committee and that action has been sustained by the vote just a few minutes ago.

Mr. COOLEY. May I say for the benefit of the gentleman who made the inquiry that I have been advised by a member of the Committee on Ways and Means that the item I just introduced and which my amendment relates to did originate in the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BUDGE. Be that as it may, in view of the fact that the \$2½ million for this purpose is not carried in the bill, then \$100,000 should not be carried to pay the salaries of the people who were to set the program in operation.

Mr. COOLEY. I thought that the whole \$2½ million was to pay the salaries or scholarships or provide a program for the training of personnel?

Mr. BUDGE. I may say to the gentleman that the amendment which he offered would have done that, but since the amendment was not adopted and since there are no funds in the bill for that program, we should eliminate \$100,000 to pay the Federal salaries to put the program in operation.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is probably right.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to be in opposition to my good friend from Idaho all the time, but the committee did make a cut in this item. We cut it \$216,000. One of the main reasons I cannot go along with this amendment is because of the amendment we voted on last year, the change in social security, where we added to it aid to the totally and permanently disabled. That has required a bigger workload on the people who administer this program, because every month there are new States taking advantage of the act. There are only a small number now.

Another reason is that under this \$2 million we require them to make administrative reviews of the workings in the States doing work in this field. Now, I think it would have some effect on those reviews, and that is something I do not think anybody wants to interfere with.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. It is correct, is it not, that approximately \$100,000 in this item

is for the purpose of training welfare personnel? Is that not correct?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is right, but we have already in the committee eliminated \$216,000 from what they requested. So it is \$116,000 less than they would have had if they had the \$2.5 million that was offered by the gentleman from North Carolina for administration.

Mr. BUDGE. The committee print which came to the full committee says this: The increase will provide for increases in monetary costs of approximately \$100,000 and about \$152,000 for personnel and related expenses necessary in administering the new training program. Now, that means the program we have just been discussing of training welfare personnel. Is it not correct that there is still about \$100,000 in this bill to set up that program that has just been defeated by a division vote?

Mr. FOGARTY. Well, I think the gentleman has a point. You can look at it that way if you want to in relation to what is in the report, but I still maintain that when we, the committee, cut the requests by \$216,000, we gave it a good slice, and at the same time we did not want to prohibit or relax the administrative reviews of our State agencies from year to year. Now, that is something that all Members of Congress have worked for many years to keep up, and that is the only way we can keep efficient operation, and that is to allow these administrative reviews.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. It is true, however, that we did allow in the subcommittee markup \$100,000 for this work, and then the full committee knocked this particular program out. In accordance with our subcommittee report this would be a correction to do away with the \$100,000 that we did allow in the subcommittee to handle the program.

Mr. FOGARTY. The whole effect of this would be to cut \$316,000 out of the administration of one of the hugest programs in the Federal Government. Now, if you want to do that and take chances and let the States go wild in the administration of their programs and cost more money in the end, this is the way to do it, by reducing administrative expenses.

Mr. LAIRD. Would not this money be tied up in terms of the committee report with this particular new program which has just been disallowed?

Mr. FOGARTY. No. I still maintain it is a \$216,000 cut in the overall budget, in the entire amount.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Am I correct in my information to the effect that we need \$105 million and in the supplemental bill we only provide \$99 million, and therefore we are \$6 million short in administrative costs for this program?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is State and local administration that the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. COOLEY. I know.



Mr. FOGARTY. This is Federal administration of the program that we are talking about now.

Mr. COOLEY. But we are short \$6 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. That supplemental bill is still in conference. We do not know what is going to come out of it.

Mr. COOLEY. But unless it is restored to \$105 million, we will be short \$6 million.

Mr. FOGARTY. Those are not the figures given to the committee in the first place by the administration.

Mr. COOLEY. They were not the figures?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; they were not.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE].

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Salaries and expenses, Office of the Secretary: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary, \$1,800,000, together with not to exceed \$260,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEMPHILL: On page 35, line 17, strike out "\$1,800,000" and insert "\$1,588,000."

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely cuts back the appropriation for the Office of the Secretary to what they were given last year. In an effort to determine the justification for the appropriation for the next year, I went back not only to the hearings themselves but to the report of the subcommittee and its chairman, whose work here has been magnificent. I find in the report which that subcommittee made on this particular item the following language:

The committee was not convinced that conditions have changed sufficiently during the last year to warrant another increase as substantial as was requested. The amount included in the bill is sufficient to cover all increases in mandatory costs and will provide about \$100,000 for increases in staff and related expenses.

I then turned back to the hearings on pages 82, 83, 84, and 85, and I found this. The Secretary who was testifying at the time said:

Since my experience clearly indicates the need for greater top level assistance, I plan to recommend a change in law which will authorize a third Assistant Secretary.

He went on to say:

I do not wish to develop a centralization of operating responsibilities.

Finally the distinguished gentleman of the subcommittee was forced to ask him:

Why should you ask for double the increase you received last year?

Mr. Chairman, my position is very simple. Where I come from a public office is a public trust and every dime I am giving to appropriate or pass on is a public trust, whether it is so small an amount as \$5 or \$100,000, or whether it is in the millions or billions with which

you gentlemen have been accustomed to deal. But if it is only \$5 it is important.

Only yesterday I talked over the telephone to one of my constituents. I asked him how things were down home and he said:

We are in trouble down here. You know, it is tax time. We are having to postpone the payment on the television and the payment to the insurance man and the payment on other obligations which we consider necessary to our living. What are you people up there in the Congress going to do about it? You have promised us some economy. What are you going to say now? I understand you are voting on some bill now. You are my Congressman. What do you have to say?

I am telling him here on the floor of this House that I am for economy. And I want to tell you something else. I looked at page 243 of the budget report. I admit I am not so familiar with this because I have not had the privilege of being here very long. But I find this in the budget, that we are paying one man \$25,000 and he has two under secretaries or assistants at \$17,500; and so on.

Maybe the people where I come from are wrong. But when we pay a man a big salary, they want him to do the job, and the people of my district and the people of this great United States have told me as a Congressman, "to tighten your belt and do your job."

I want this House to tell this Secretary and these people in that office that, "It is time to tighten your belt and do a job for America. We are paying you a big salary. We are imposing in you a great trust. We want you to give us the economy we are paying you for. We are not only hiring your services, we are hiring your brains and your abilities." That is what the American people are paying for, insofar as I am concerned.

I realize there are certain mandatory costs in this particular legislation. The thought occurred to me there, are we not going to have mandatory costs every year? Are we not going to have increases every year? If we are going to submit each year some requests for increased funds, are we not going to have trouble?

How can we ever turn to the people and say, "Well, we have cut the budget on one hand and we can give you some economy on the other"? After all, if I am correct in my understanding of the representative form of government, what I do here is for the people back home. The taxpayer is the man I have heard so little about here. Here is the Office of the Secretary. If he is a big-capacity man, and I assume he is to earn that salary, and if he has two assistants drawing \$17,500 a year, and they are, then they have sense enough to tighten the budget and do the job.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MASON. I am very sorry; I am in full accord, but I must object.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I understand.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the author of this amendment was here in the last Congress, and I stand corrected on that if he was; but I will say to you who were in the last Congress that you voted for the social-security amendments which Mr. Folsom has to administer; you voted for a new Water Pollution Control Act; you voted for the Health Survey Act; you voted for the Library Services Act; you voted for the National Library of Medicine Act, and for the Health Research Facilities Act, and for Public Law 911, involving graduate training of professional public health personnel, advanced training of professional nurses, vocational education for practical nurses, and authorization for special project grants in the field of mental health; and you also voted for the Air Pollution Control Act. These are just small pieces of legislation that you voted for in the last 2 years. Now, after you have added these additional responsibilities, which are going to tax the Department tremendously, this amendment is offered to cut them \$100,000 below what they had in 1957.

When you come down here and say, "This is just a little old amendment; it ain't going to hurt them any; it's just going to cut them back to 1957," that is just not so. The amendment that has been offered by my friend will cut them \$100,000 below what they had to operate with in 1957, even though we have by our own votes given them these additional responsibilities.

You talk about the people back home. Did they not want the Library Services Act; did they not want this Water Pollution Control Act? Yes. They did not want any of these cut out. But if you want good administration you have to give these agencies the tools to work with. You cannot come down here in the well like this and make a speech such as you just delivered expecting them to tighten their belts and administer a program that is too large for them now to administer well.

We operated on this budget before you took a look at it. We allowed the Department only one-third of the increase in personnel they asked for because we wanted to be a little bit conservative too. But when you come in here now and ask them to operate on a budget that is \$100,000 less than they had in 1957, with all these new programs you voted for in the past 2 years, it just does not make good commonsense.

They are understaffed now, and you are going to understaff them further. You are going to make them lay off about 20 people, and you would be the first one to find fault when something came up in the administration of these projects where they were loosely administered, and then blame the people downtown for not doing a good job because you did not give them the tools to work with.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Who fixed the salaries the gentleman mentioned a moment ago?

Mr. FOGARTY. Congress fixed them in a pay act. We voted for it. I am

surprised that good men continue to accept these responsible positions for \$17,500 when they could earn much more outside the Government. They come down to Washington and do their best for their agencies and for their country, and then they are subjected to the abuse that they get on the floor of this House by remarks that have been made to the effect that they can tighten their belts and do a better job, particularly when many of them are working overtime up to 7 or 8 o'clock each night. I do not think it is fair to the Federal personnel. I do not think it is fair to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I think he is trying to do a good job with what he has. I think we ought to help him to do a good job and not hurt him and cut him off as this amendment would do.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I concur in the remarks made by the gentleman. This amendment does drastically reduce the employment level in the Office of the Secretary, if it is adopted in the form in which it is now presented. I repeat, I concur in the remarks made by the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. There is no other way that it can work and it can only work one way. If you want to prevent him from doing a good job in administering these programs that we have passed legislation for, if you want him to administer these programs in a slipshod way, then that is the kind of administration you are asking for by voting for a cut like this. As I said before, we only gave him one-third of the personnel he asked for to administer this program. I thought that we were pretty drastic in the cut that we made. I thought we were being very conservative. But, when you come in here and ask to cut out 20 positions below what they had in 1957, in my opinion, that is going too far.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Rhode Island has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FOGARTY) there were—ayes 51, noes 76.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Office of Field Administration: For expenses necessary for the Office of Field Administration, \$2,300,000, together with not to exceed \$700,000 to be transferred from the Federal old-age and survivors insurance trust fund.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HEMPHILL: On page 35, line 22, strike out "\$2,300,000" and insert "\$1,985,000."

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Chairman, I told the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island that he made a good speech a while ago. I think he did. I have listened here day after day with a great

deal of patience, and I have listened to him time after time because he has done a good job. But, I still say it is necessary to economize. The only things I have to guide me are the reports of the committee and of the subcommittee. The reports I find in the budget and the demand from the people back home. If these be not worthy of consideration, then I stand to be corrected. I read from the report of the committee a short time ago, and I want to read again from it with reference to this particular amendment by which I seek only to take us back to the fiscal year 1957.

If you believe it does just read pages 246 and 248 and 249 of the budget, if you have not already done so.

On this particular amendment I find that the committee reported as follows:

Most of the increase was requested for grant-in-aid auditors necessary because of the increases in the grant-in-aid programs and for additional personnel to handle such work as voucher review, payrolling, etc., for the additional personnel in the field to administer the new and expanded programs authorized by the last session of Congress.

Then the committee goes on to say:

During the last few years the committee has also attempted, without success, to secure a logical explanation of why this office feels that it can perform, in the regional offices, such common services as voucher review, payrolling, processing personnel actions, etc., for other field offices of the Department more efficiently than the bureaus can perform these services themselves.

Perhaps I am wrong in raising my voice in this regard, but I want to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the Members of Congress, this Congress—and I was not in the last Congress—whether we are taking orders from the administrative office or from a bureaucrat? Or whether this Congress has the right to say to some bureau or department of the Government to run their organization more efficiently. Do we not have the right in keeping with the philosophy of government to say that they should use these auditing facilities of some other department of the Government rather than set up expensive personnel to duplicate the work?

I have not criticized the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; I have not said he or she did a bad job. I have said this, I have said that the American people have a right to demand of me and you and of every person in the employ of the Government, whether it be a bureaucrat, a public servant, or whatnot, that he dedicate to his work the best he can give. And I say we have a right to demand this same thing of him or of her as of any other person we hire, because in private business today when you hire someone you expect the best of him, and that is what we ought to insist on in Government.

I believe if we were to tell these people that we have sought economy, we have voted for economy, we know that our people want economy, that it is up to them to do something about it, they would do something about it.

I do not want to see one single person dropped off the payroll, but I do not know that it is a crime to fire anybody in the interest of good government; I

do not know that it is a crime to cut down personnel if you can save the taxpayers millions of dollars; and if I am wrong I can be corrected at the polls.

I do not think it is wrong to demand efficiency, and I do not think it is wrong to demand economy. I did not have the privilege of being here during the last Congress or any of the preceding Congresses, but I have had the privilege of being an American taxpayer and an American citizen. Finally, I came to be a Member of this distinguished body of great people, and I have found them to be great people, I have found that we have the same obligations of man to man, of Congressmen to constituents, of legislators to taxpayers.

If we just gave the taxpayer perhaps some support and encouragement he would believe in this Government like I have always believed in it as a Government based on high levels from legislators down to the man down at the grassroots, who is paying the taxes.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the same argument can be used against the pending amendment that was used a while ago, only more so. When we considered this appropriation request we should remember that they also asked for five additional administrative officers and five additional secretaries for strengthening five regional directors' offices. We disallowed that which was for overall direction in the regional offices. The only things that we have allowed for are to take care of the expanded programs that we have voted for last year.

There are no top jobs added by the committee, I can assure you; only clerks, accountants, and auditors. Some fault has been found both by the States and Members of Congress regarding the auditing of these programs. We have been way behind in this work. We have attempted through the years to correct that situation by increasing the allowance for auditors. This amendment would cut out some of these auditors who audit the Federal grants-in-aid. It would also cut out personnel that are handling the payrolling of the field employees of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors' Insurance and other HEW field offices, the recruitment of personnel to carry out these programs, processing their travel vouchers, and so forth. They are working on a deficiency basis now and we have a deficiency appropriation request pending before our committee at this time because the expanded programs make it impossible to carry out this work with funds available for 1957.

Because we changed the social-security amendments last year, it resulted in a tremendous increase in the number of recipients of old-age and survivors' insurance. These people who should only wait a period of 30 days for their checks are now forced to wait a period of 60 days. Because we have not been able to recruit and train the number of personnel necessary to man these OASI offices we are falling behind in processing the claims of these people who are on relief to the extent of about 60 days. They told us in the hearing the average delay



in the past was less than 30 days. Today we are making these people wait 60 days.

This is going to make matters even worse for these people who have benefits coming from the old-age and survivors' insurance fund because it will prevent the Department from recruiting and hiring the additional personnel they need to administer these programs. I do not think anyone wants to do that. I do not think anyone in this House wants to extend the time that these men and women are waiting now to draw checks from the old-age and survivors' insurance fund.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the statement just made by the chairman of the subcommittee. This particular item does have to do with the staffing of these local offices and recruiting the necessary personnel to man them. I think it would be false economy to adopt an amendment of this kind. We have now a delay all over the country, particularly in the rural areas, of some 60 days. This additional force for the Office of Field Administration is necessary if we are going to keep this under control at all.

Mr. FOGARTY. The gentleman from Wisconsin is entirely correct. If we adopt the pending amendment it means we are going to extend that waiting period of 60 days still further. That burden will be borne by people who do not and cannot speak for themselves, who are waiting to get these checks at the end of the month. I do not think any Member of this body wants to do that, but that is what the pending amendment would do.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMP-HILL].

The amendment was rejected.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my pro forma amendment will not require any additional money. I simply rise to ask the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations if he knows of any group within the Department of Labor that is trying to screen the refugee workers, for instance the Hungarians who came into this country, to see that they are not put into industry thereby putting our established workers out of work. I know of a number of cases like that in the State of Massachusetts where workers have been employed for a long time in industry, then they are turned out into the streets and Hungarians, who do not speak our language, are put in their places. In other words, we are making refugees of our own workers. It seems to me these people should be placed in sections of the country where labor is needed and not to replace our own people.

Mr. FOGARTY. The answer is "No" to that specific question that the gentleman has asked. But we did attempt to allow some increase in funds for the Bureau of Labor Statistics or the

Bureau of Employment Security. I do not know which, to the extent of \$100,000 to permit them to make a study of the effects of foreign workers who are coming into this country on the local labor groups that the gentleman is speaking about. That allowance was cut out, however, by an amendment offered by a Member of this House.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am not speaking of farm laborers alone.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am not, either.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am speaking of persons in industry.

Mr. FOGARTY. We had \$100,000 for that purpose in here but it was stricken out by one of the amendments that were adopted to this bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am taking the matter up with the CIO and the American Federation of Labor because I think they surely ought to be very much interested in seeing that their own workers are protected. I am suggesting that they have a commission to place the Hungarians where they can be cared for and not put our labor on relief.

Mr. FOGARTY. On page 7 we did allow \$120,000 for an analysis of the effect of tariff changes on United States unemployment. That is one of the things I was referring to. But, the answer to the first question is "No." There are no employees in the Department of Labor doing what the gentleman asked about.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But it would be helpful if it were done to protect our own labor.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think it would, yes. I do not know whether we can do it under the existing legislation in the Department of Labor, but if the gentleman sponsored legislation, I would be very happy to work with her.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I thank the most courteous gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I advise the gentleman that there were attempts made to bring Hungarian miners into the mines of West Virginia when there are 141,000 unemployed miners in the State of West Virginia now.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes, and that is tragic. We ought to take care of the Hungarians in some other way, I think.

Mr. BAILEY. Certainly.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that the Department of Labor does have information now along the very lines that she is interested in and is making thorough studies of this particular matter. I received information from them just the other day on a request that I placed before them. With reference to the cut, I believe that has to do entirely with tariff studies and has no relation to the matter that was raised by the gentleman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am not referring to the cut; I am referring to the general proposition.

Mr. LAIRD. The general proposition is now under study and is under constant study by the Department of Labor and the Department of Labor has information available.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. We ought to take immediate action when the people's jobs are at stake. We have great respect for the courage of the Hungarians but for their own sakes we must not have them hurt our labor.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I know of the gentleman's deep interest for the people in our areas who are out of work.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman and I know what it means so completely.

Mr. FOGARTY. And I would like to call her attention to the fact that we have—and this affects employment in this country—an item of \$120,000 for the analysis of the effect of tariff changes, and I know that she has been very much interested in tariff legislation, and this will help in that regard. If the gentleman will give us some help on these rollcalls, we can help her on that, too.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman has rubber industry in his district just as I have in mine, and we know what foreign competition means to that industry. Management and labor in the rubber industry were the last ones asking for tariff protection.

Mr. FOGARTY. This will help. If the gentleman will help tomorrow, she will be helping this situation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will be glad to help.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder, since the gentleman from Rhode Island has referred to rollcalls either tonight or tomorrow, if he would indicate to us just what amendments he intends to demand rollcalls on. Now, I have offered five amendments to this bill, all of which have been adopted, and I would like to know which ones the gentleman intends to call the roll on.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think the first one would be the Smith amendment cutting the solicitor's office.

The second one would be the one bearing the gentleman's name, called the Budge amendment, which cuts the veterans. The third would be the Smith amendment cutting the Bureau of Employment Security. The fourth, the Murray amendment, is a cut dealing with the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Fifth, the Anderson amendment cutting the Women's Bureau. The sixth would be the Hébert amendment cutting the Wage and Hour Division. The seventh would be the Jonas amendment cutting the Food and Drug Administration. The eighth would be the Dorn amendment cutting the Department of Education. Ninth is the Fisher amendment deleting \$50 million for grants for waste treatment works construction.

We will have to wait until the end of the bill to see if we have any others. I have the gentleman down for one.

Mr. BUDGE. Well, that is the reason I asked the question. It places the authors of the amendments in rather a peculiar position when you want to call the roll on some of the amendments, and when they are all on the same theory. Would it not be proper to assume, from a reading of the amendments that the gentleman is seeking a rollcall on, that he favors the other amendments?

Mr. FOGARTY. Oh, no. I was just trying to save the time of the House. But I have all this week and next week, and if you desire to have a rollcall on some of these smaller amendments, I will be very happy to cooperate with you.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] that I certainly do not want to drag this matter out any longer than is necessary, but when five amendments are adopted, all of which propose the same thing, I cannot quite understand why the gentleman is so selective as to pick out only one bearing my name and leaving out the others. Is there some difference in the others?

Mr. FOGARTY. What are some of the others? Will the gentleman refresh my recollection? Maybe I have forgotten one or two.

Mr. BUDGE. Of course, it may work out that we would be constrained as the authors of the amendments to ask for a rollcall on all of them rather than just permit the gentleman from Rhode Island to pick out the ones he feels most sympathetic to.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is the gentleman's prerogative. I have given the House notice of what I intend to do as chairman of this subcommittee in the matter of asking for rollcalls on amendments. I hope that there will be a sufficient number of Members on this side and on the gentleman's side to get a rollcall. If the gentleman has any other amendments in mind on which he wants to get a rollcall, I shall be happy to cooperate with him in that regard.

Mr. BUDGE. I should like the gentleman, if he is going to ask for a rollcall on any other amendments that I have offered, all of which were intended to retain personnel at the present level, to ask for a rollcall on each of them instead of picking out one that happens to bear my name, toward which he seems to be sympathetic.

Mr. FOGARTY. I would suggest to the gentleman that he ask for a rollcall on any amendment he has in mind. I have mentioned the ones that I think are important and that I think the membership would want to vote on. I have made my selection. If the gentleman wants to add any to those, I shall cooperate with him.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate having had this colloquy with the gentleman from Rhode Island because it would help explain an action which we, as authors of these amendments, may feel constrained to take if the gentleman proceeds in the manner which he has outlined.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman, I am going to

proceed in exactly the manner I have just outlined.

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman. Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, can we learn what time this day of judgment begins tomorrow and what the schedule of voting will be?

The CHAIRMAN. That announcement will come from the leadership.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 208. Not to exceed \$2,500 of the funds available to the Department for salaries and expenses and not otherwise available for entertainment of officials of other countries or officials of international organizations shall be available for such entertainment when authorized by the Secretary.

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against this paragraph, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes his point of order against the entire section?

Mr. HIESTAND. Section 208, lines 5 to 9, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island care to comment on this point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I must concede the point of order. The purpose of this paragraph is to entertain some of these foreign doctors and scientists who come over here, to reciprocate the entertainment that our people receive when they go over there. If the gentleman wants to strike it out, that is his privilege.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman insist on the point of order?

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Chairman, I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 211. None of the funds provided herein shall be used, either directly or indirectly, for construction or planning of any building for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the lease-purchase program, nor shall any of the funds provided herein be used to pay the salary of any person who assists or consults with anyone in connection with the construction or planning of any building for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under the lease-purchase program.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 211 in its entirety as being legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. This language is purely a limitation on the use of funds, as I read it, in the bill we have before us.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Wisconsin makes a point of order against section 211 on page 38 of the bill. The Chair has read the section and finds that it is a pure limitation, and therefore overrules the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE III—NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Labor Relations Board to carry out the functions vested in it by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U. S. C. 141-167), and other laws, including expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Board when specifically authorized by the Chairman or the General Counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U. S. C. 2131); \$9,450,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available to organize or assist in organizing agricultural laborers or used in connection with investigations, hearings, directives, or orders concerning bargaining units composed of agricultural laborers as referred to in section 2 (3) of the act of July 5, 1935 (29 U. S. C. 152), and as amended by the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, and as defined in section 3 (f) of the act of June 25, 1938 (29 U. S. C. 203), and including in said definition employees engaged in the maintenance and operation of ditches, canals, reservoirs, and waterways when maintained or operated on a mutual, nonprofit basis and at least 95 percent of the water stored or supplied thereby is used for farming purposes.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SELDEN: On page 39, line 17, strike out "\$9,450,000" and insert "\$9,384,800."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SELDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. FOGARTY. The amount provided in the gentleman's amendment is \$9,384,800?

Mr. SELDEN. That is right. It is a cut of \$65,200.

Mr. FOGARTY. On behalf of the committee, Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment.

Mr. SELDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain all Members of Congress are aware that there is growing concern throughout this country over the magnitude of the Federal budget. In my opinion, that concern is justified.

I believe, as do many in the Congress, that there are items in the 1958 budget requests of the President that can be safely reduced. At the same time, I realize that the Congress should make certain that any cuts that are made in the budget will not jeopardize the security of this Nation or scuttle programs that are vital to the well-being of its people.

With this in mind, I am offering an amendment which, if adopted, will make a small reduction in a budget item. Yet, this reduction should have little, if any, effect on the operation of the agency concerned.

The amendment now under consideration will bring about a reduction of \$65,200 in the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board. The sum of \$9,384,800, which this amendment provides, will give the National Labor Relations Board the entire amount it had in its budget for the present fiscal year plus the mandatory contribution of \$433,300



that must be made to the retirement fund.

In his testimony before the subcommittee, the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Boyd Ledom, testified that the Board's request for funds for 1958 was geared to the same case inflow as in 1957. The amendment now before you will provide the same funds for 1958 as were provided in 1957 plus the mandatory contribution to the retirement fund.

Last year Congress reduced the budget request of the National Labor Relations Board by nearly \$2 million. The Board has operated satisfactorily despite the reduction, and one of the witnesses who appeared before the Appropriations Subcommittee, in effect, so stated.

The reduction of \$65,200 provided in this amendment is less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of the committee's recommendation of nearly \$9½ million. A decrease of such a small percent of a budget item of this magnitude should have little, if any, effect on the operation of this important Board. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### TITLE IX—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 901. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes not authorized by the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gross: Page 43, immediately following line 6, insert the following: "No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for payment of any expert or consultant, or of any management engineering corporation, company, firm, or other organization, for the performance of any service relating to the management, organization, or operation of the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, or any related agency, unless the utilization and payment of experts or consultants, or of management engineering corporations, companies, firms, or other organizations, is specifically authorized by law for the performance of such service."

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa wish to speak to his amendment?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; but I should like the gentleman to press the point of order. There is no use in wasting time if a point of order will rest against the amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Gross amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman in support of my amendment, I invite your

attention to page 266 of the hearings of the subcommittee, which shows that the Department of Labor last year employed some 50 consultants apparently to look into management of that Department. I also invite your attention to page 73 of the hearings wherein the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] asked representatives from the Department of Labor what services these consultants had performed. The hearings are silent as to what services these consultants performed for the Department of Labor. If I am wrong in that, and if there is anything in the hearings to establish that these 40 to 50 consultants provided any worthwhile services, I wish the gentleman would so advise me and tell me where that information may be found in the hearings.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. FOGARTY. I believe I answered the gentleman last week when I said that we did not get any answer on that. That was about these management people who were hired to make a survey in the Department of Labor; is that what the gentleman is referring to?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Now turn to page 266 of the hearings, we find a list of the consultants who were employed last year by the Department of Labor. There is no indication of who they are by profession or what their qualifications, and the hearings are absolutely silent as to how much this cost the taxpayer or out of what funds these people were paid. My amendment is not as restrictive as I would like to make it because I understand that to make it as restrictive as it should be would make it legislation on an appropriation bill. But, I do think it will serve as a deterrent. Let me say I intend to offer this amendment or a similar amendment to every appropriation bill that is brought to the floor of the House from here on out.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I wonder if the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman also applies to the National Institutes of Health and other contract work that is done on the outside such as the new cancer research that we will be doing outside by contract next year with the pharmaceutical houses.

Mr. GROSS. I do not believe it would apply. I want to stop this business of every department and agency of the Government going out and hiring consultants to come in and tell them what to do. We have under secretaries, assistant secretaries, deputy secretaries, and assistants to the deputies falling all over themselves all over the Government, and yet we are spending huge sums of money to hire consultants to tell them how to run the business of the various bureaus and agencies.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would make a little further inquiry, he would find that representatives of the Department of Labor sit on the consideration given to the General

Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. That has never been authorized by the Congress. I think the question that the gentleman raises here and the point he is making in striking that out is well taken because it is happening not only in the Department of Commerce and the Department of State, but in several other departments. There is no authorization by the Congress for any of that.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of California. I want to compliment the gentleman in what he is doing. What we are doing is hiring some of these outside firms and taking competent people out of the Government who could do this job as well as they can in some of these outside firms.

Mr. GROSS. Yes, and these consultants and personnel-management experts come to our own committee staffs and get a big share of the information which they develop into extensive reports and hand back to us at fat fees and contracts.

Mr. MILLER of California. That is right and I compliment the gentleman on offering his amendment.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the distinguished gentleman from Iowa. Last Tuesday, when he first raised the question about these consultants who were being hired by the Department of Labor, and when he raised the question of what results we obtained from that type of consultation, I stated that as far as I knew we did not get any results. However, the reason I rise in opposition to this amendment is that the amendment goes much further than you would want to go and much further than I would want to go. I am in agreement with what the gentleman wants and what he is trying to get at. But, we have in the Public Health Service grants for research, heart disease, mental health, and so on.

We have advisory committees, which pass upon the applications for research before they come to the Surgeon General, that this would affect. It would affect our contracts with the pharmaceutical houses to which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] referred. At the National Institutes of Health Research Center they call in outside doctors on some of these special cases on a consultative basis, and this amendment would prohibit the employment or the payment of people like that. I do not think you want that to happen. I know I do not.

But I agree with the criticism the gentleman raises because I asked that question in the hearings on the Department of Labor. I asked what savings have come about as a result of the survey that they made 2 years ago; and the answer was, "Practically nothing."

But I do not think you want to go to the degree that your amendment goes, as far as the Public Health Service is concerned. Your amendment will seriously hurt the study sections and advisory committees that pass upon the applications for research into these diseases.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. In view of the gentleman's statement I would like to ask the gentleman if he could not offer an amendment to the amendment which would take care of the needs the gentleman has expressed but also eliminate the evils that the gentleman from Iowa sought to reach.

Mr. FOGARTY. I am sure we all want to correct the things the gentleman criticizes, but I think his amendment goes too far and I am concerned. If the gentleman would withdraw the amendment and offer a new amendment not so broad, which would reach the management surveys where they have been used in other departments, the Post Office Department and so forth, I think it would do what he wanted to do. I am sure the gentleman does not want to hurt the Public Health Service in the work they are doing of that type.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I have no desire to harm any worthwhile consultative work, but let me say to the gentleman that unless something is adopted in this bill he would not have anything to go to conference on. Is not that true?

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not like the idea of adopting an amendment like this that affects the basic research program of the Public Health Service as the gentleman's amendment will do. I would hope the gentleman would withdraw it and offer another amendment dealing with the overall management service problem in the Government. But if that cannot be done, the only thing I can think of is to oppose the amendment because the amendment goes much further than the gentleman wants to go, and he says so himself. It will affect the Public Health Service and the National Institutes of Health, and as long as it does that I just cannot go along with the amendment. We are in agreement as to the point we are trying to reach, but the gentleman's amendment goes far beyond that and I cannot support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to set forth now just what these amendments that have been passed during the last week and 2 days will do, so that Members will have an opportunity to acquaint themselves with the effect they will have without going through the quite voluminous record we have built up.

First, the Department of Labor.

#### OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Your action eliminated the increase for the Office of International Labor Affairs amounting to \$30,000—a small sum to insure adequacy of the knowledge of the Department in the movement of workers and worker organizations in various parts of the world. It has been said many times that labor organizations

are the first target point for Communists to try and make inroads. It is important that the Secretary in recommending labor policy both here and abroad have close to him staff advisory assistance. Again I say \$30,000 is a small amount of money for this purpose.

#### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Here is where you become very ambitious. You not only cut this office back to 1957 but you did not allow money for the mandatory increases for retirement and transfer of funds previously approved in another appropriation. In the committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$2,225,000 there was only \$22,000 for program increases. The balance was for mandatory items. If your action stands, this means a reduction of some 35 positions—this reduction coming at a time when the workload of the Solicitor's Office shows increasing activity. The Solicitor's Office is beginning to feel in greater numbers the impact of litigation as a result of the recent amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act. The legislative requirement that the wage orders in Puerto Rico be reviewed annually has added a new burden to this Office. I cannot take the time here to go into all the details but I assure you that evidence was supplied in committee which was definitely convincing that the staff requested was needed. If the Solicitor's Office cannot carry out his litigation responsibilities there will be complaints not only from labor but there will be complaints from employers that unfair employers are taking advantage of them. Likewise workers will not receive the wages to which they are entitled by law. The Government will be the loser because third party suits under the Federal Employees Compensation Act will have to be passed by because of insufficient staff. Thousands and thousands of dollars have been recovered by the Government through this legal technique.

#### MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

We had quite a debate on this item yesterday and I will not burden you with much detail. What you have done is quite simple. The program will be 15 percent larger in 1958 than in 1957. For this increased workload, the committee proposed a mere 4-percent increase in appropriations. You wiped out this small increase—the result of which means a deterioration of the program. More specifically you endanger an international agreement between this country and Mexico by making it impossible to carry out certain guarantees the Mexican Government requires for its nationals coming to this country to work in agriculture. Does not the figure of over 400,000 importations during the current fiscal year indicate the need for this program? As long as we enjoy a high level of employment we will need this program. As long as we enjoy a few thousands of savings is just a mistake.

#### BUREAU OF LABOR STANDARDS

In the Bureau of Labor Standards the committee reduced the request here by \$135,700. It allowed \$119,800 increase over 1957, of which \$52,200 was for program increases. Program increases re-

lated to aiding in the employment of the physically handicapped, extension of safety service in the use of atomic energy, and improving conditions of domestic migrant workers. The balance of \$67,600 was for mandatory items. The action on the floor eliminated the program increases for enabling the Bureau to keep abreast of accident hazards in the atomic energy field and institute such action in their safety program necessary to promote safety for the workers involved.

#### BUREAU OF VETERANS' REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS

Perhaps the most shocking thing of all has happened here. By shaving off \$136,000 from the committee recommendation, you are making necessary an actual reduction in level of operations for this most crucial activity.

As I stated on Tuesday, curtailment of other benefits for servicemen entering on duty after January 31, 1955, makes the reemployment program the only major readjustment device available to veterans.

The workload of this bureau will be substantially increased because of the buildup in the Ready Reserves. The number of reservists and National Guard men who must perform training duty in 1958 will be about 40 percent over 1956 and 25 percent over 1957. This increase is due to the fact that all military releases after August 1957 must accept duty in the Active Reserve.

Because of your action this week, this Bureau will not be able to render adequate service to the veterans.

#### BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Let us see what damage you have done in reducing the committee recommendation for the Bureau of Employment Security by \$442,000. The committee had allowed only \$89,560 for program increases including a transfer of \$53,300 from the Office of the Secretary. Cutting it back to the 1957 level without making allowances for mandatory items will make necessary the reduction of 60 positions. Let us take a look at the history. We have increased programs through legislation, increased the funds for State employment agencies, but we have done nothing to allow the national office to keep up with its expanding responsibilities. Specifically, it is responsible for supervision directly or indirectly of the handling of \$1½ billion in unemployment insurance tax collection; \$1¼ billion in unemployment insurance benefits; and one-fourth billion dollars in administrative funds. It is the one operating arm of Government that actually aids in the placement of the older worker into a job. Likewise it occupies the same role in placing physically handicapped workers into jobs they can perform. I believe you have made a terrible mistake in the action you took on Wednesday in reducing the appropriation request. If this action is sustained in the House it will cut out the new program planned to help those areas with chronic problems of unemployment; it would very seriously impair the program to increase the placement of the handicapped through the development of better programs for the State and local employment officer; and it would even stop the program for the



older worker, that really was not an increase at all, but just a transfer of activities from the Secretary's Office with the intention that it evolve from a planning program into an action program.

#### BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS

Cutting the program increases out of the Bureau of Labor Statistics request will be disastrous. This Bureau in the field of research and statistics is considered the best in its field. Its work is used by all of us as well as by management and labor and the public. As an example, again I remind you of the danger of cutting funds needed to insure accuracy of the Consumer Price Index. Four million workers' wages go up or down as this index moves. It must be accurate. It has become the biggest tool for settling management and labor differences on wage questions. Imagine what will happen if the accuracy of the index is questioned.

Time will not permit detail presentation of all this Bureau's programs, but I assure the Members of this body that its work in the field of wages, employment, productivity, wholesale and retail prices, are all important to our economy and they are used extensively. I think you all know that. It should not be allowed to deteriorate, but if your action stands that will be the result.

#### WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

You have sliced \$388,000 from the Wage and Hour Division, with the result that there will have to be an actual reduction in level of operations. This at a time when the rate of back wages found due is at the highest level ever—about \$20 million a year.

Two years ago, this body, by an overwhelming vote, increased the minimum wage from 75 cents to \$1. Are we now saying that we do not want to enforce that minimum? Wage-hour investigations show that 1 out of every 5 firms are violating the dollar minimum.

The committee's recommendation for an appropriation of \$10,888,000 would not add a single employee to the Division. By cutting this item, you have reduced the staff and consequently reduced the level of enforcement of the Fair Labor Standards Act and the Public Contracts Act.

You will cause a reduction in the already too small sample inspection check which at this time is only 7 percent of 800,000 covered establishments.

You will handicap the Division carrying out its legislative responsibility of reviewing each wage order in Puerto Rico annually. If this work lags you will hear plenty from employers in the mainland.

Then in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, while there were not nearly so many amendments adopted as in the Department of Labor, the amendments that were adopted certainly will have a disastrous effect if they are sustained by the House. I want to set forth some facts regarding them also.

#### FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

The Jones amendment would reduce this agency's appropriation from \$9,300,000 to \$7,973,000. This reduction would bring to an abrupt halt the orderly pro-

gram, started last year, to bring this agency to the point where it can do a decent job of protecting the American men, women, and children from dangerous and filthy foods and drugs. It will stop this program that was initiated on the unanimous recommendation of a citizens committee appointed in 1954 to make an objective study of this problem. That committee recommended a threefold to fourfold expansion of this agency within a period of 5 to 10 years just to give the American people minimum assurances of protection against foods and drugs that endanger health and even life, for that matter; 1957 was the first year of the program to carry out the citizens committee recommendations and the increase was 10 percent. The amendment would stop us at that point—a point that, according to a group of our most eminent citizens, endangers the safety of every American.

#### OFFICE OF EDUCATION

The Dorn amendment to the salaries and expenses for this office reduces the appropriation, if it passes the House, from \$7 million to \$5,518,000.

In 1957 Congress authorized the Office of Education to begin research on educational problems of the mentally retarded and in a few other highly important areas. Sixty-four research projects are now under way in cooperation with colleges, universities, and State departments of education. This is the start that was made to carry out the so-called cooperative research program in education that we authorized 2 years ago.

Estimates place the present number of school-age mentally retarded children at more than 1 million. Large numbers of those classed as mentally handicapped are potentially useful members of society providing they receive proper training and education. There is a specific need to determine what the school can reasonably do and how it can best be done. Substantial need also exists for basic research in educational problems of mentally retarded children.

If this cut is sustained, research now under way in colleges, universities, and State educational institutions would have to be cut back at once. Contracts with many of the best researchers would have to be canceled. A substantial part of the investment made to date could be lost, as most research projects must run through fiscal 1958 for completion. In this program the non-Federal participating institutions are contributing approximately 30 percent of the total cost.

This promising new program will be killed in its first year if the amendment passes.

The committee allowance for salaries in the office simply holds the 1957 level. It provides money required for full year costs of 1957 jobs and the mandatory contribution to the retirement fund. At a time when educational problems are a chief domestic concern, it does not make sense to cripple the Office of Education.

#### PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION BEYOND THE HIGH SCHOOL

The Shuford amendment would cut out all funds for the committee that

the President of the United States thought so highly of that he started it with funds taken from his special emergency fund. The President thought we have an emergency that this committee can do something about. Then less than a year ago this House passed the authorization by a unanimous vote—and it did not sneak through, there was plenty of discussion about it that day. But it passed on the Consent Calendar by unanimous consent. So if this amendment passes we are certainly reneging on what we told the people last year we were going to do about this problem of education beyond the high school that the President thinks is an emergency situation.

#### GRANTS FOR WASTE TREATMENT WORKS CONSTRUCTION

The amendment to delete the entire amount of \$50 million is, of course, another instance of trying to repeal an act that we passed by a substantial vote, and a record vote, by refusing to appropriate the funds to carry it out. But, aside from that, I would like to point out what this program would do and what will be lost if the House sustains this amendment.

Construction of sewage treatment plants has always been a costly proposition to municipalities. Since the end of World War II the financial problems presented by such construction have been growing in intensity due to rising costs associated with inflation, high interest rates, and the increased competition for materials and competent engineering talent. For instance, construction costs for treatment plants have more than doubled in the last 10 years. Furthermore the interest rate on municipal borrowing has risen from 1.49 percent in 1945 to 3.12 percent as of the week ending March 22, 1957. These factors in conjunction with the multitude of current demands on municipalities for public-works construction of all kinds—streets, school, utility extensions to new subdivisions, and public buildings—have produced an impact on the comparatively narrow tax base of municipalities that results in what many consider to be an excessive tax load. Since counties, school districts, and special districts overlap the municipal incorporated area and levy against the same tax base as the municipalities, the general financing problem often may reach the near crisis stage in many areas. This situation points to the necessity of extending the economic base for financing the municipalities, especially when the marked increase in urban populations is considered. The most feasible extension is to the Federal level, for at this level the tax structure and the economic base coincide to provide the most equitable basis for assistance to municipalities in recognition of the national interest involved.

There seems to be some misunderstanding as to the relation of sewage treatment plant construction as provided for in this program and the control of water pollution. It has been stated that this is simply a Federal grant to localities to help them pay for local utility services. This is not the case.

These grants are to step up the construction of plants to treat the increasing amount of sewage that is coming from our rapidly growing cities and towns. The benefits of a municipal sewage treatment plant are much greater to downstream water users than to the city which builds the plant. Consequently, the importance of these plants in restoring and preserving the waters of a stream so that the water can be used over again by other cities and industries transcends local interests. So if the House upholds this amendment it will not mean just withholding funds we have promised the towns and cities that will build these plants but it will mean denying all the people downstream the protection from pollution that we promised by a substantial majority, on a rollcall vote, when we passed the new Water Pollution Control Act.

At present, less than 9 months after the funds were made available, 910 communities have made application for these grants and 288 applications have been fully processed and approved in a total amount of \$24,100,000. Moneys requested by the 910 applicant communities total \$84 million. So it is pretty clear that we will not be breaking faith with just a few people if we adopt this amendment, but we will be breaking faith with hundreds of towns and cities and millions of American people all over the Nation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the parliamentary situation, if my understanding is right, is this: We will all admit that the President—or whoever wrote it for him—did the best he could when this budget was sent to us. The Committee on Appropriations, especially the subcommittee, did the best it could, when the bill was reported out.

We have debated this bill for 6 days. It is very evident that in spite of all the efforts both of the administration, of the Appropriations Committee and its subcommittee, that there is at least a slight difference of opinion between the subcommittee, the full committee, and the members of this Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. We are advised that there are at least nine amendments which were adopted on which there will be a rollcall in the House. It is my present intent to ask for a rollcall on all amendments if that is to be the procedure on the part of the majority.

This being the situation it would seem that it is about time to let the Committee on Appropriations take another look before we have a rollcall on these nine or all amendments.

The amendment which I offered here in the committee to permit a return of the bill to the committee in the hope we might get the best possible bill was ruled out of order. In order to get an opportunity to recommit with instructions sending the bill back to the committee

and asking the committee to report within 5 days, giving the committee an opportunity to reconcile its thought with the thought which the House has expressed here by the adoption of these amendments, it is necessary to strike the enacting clause of the bill, go back to the House, and then in the House offer the motion to recommit with instructions. Unless the committee now strikes the enacting clause, the first order of business when we go back into the House will be to vote at least 9 times on rollcalls. A vote on amendments will be the first order of business—unless the enacting clause is stricken now. We will not get an opportunity to offer a motion to recommit until after the rollcall has been had either 8 or 9 times on amendments, unless the pending amendment is adopted.

If Members desire to give the Committee on Appropriations an opportunity to look over the RECORD, and read some of the arguments which have been advanced in favor of the amendments which the committee has adopted, this is the way and the only way to do it. Something was said a while ago when a similar motion was offered about someone being afraid to stand up and be counted. That statement is repudiated, not only for myself, but I think I can safely say for the majority if not all the Members of the House. That was a charge of being cowardly. There was no justification for it. Is not this proposal the sensible way to get the best possible bill? Give the Committee on Appropriations—it does not claim to be perfect—an opportunity to read the RECORD and consider the will of the House, then come back within 5 days with a bill which would at the worst, be an attempt to reconcile in major part the differences of opinion which admittedly exist and let the House vote on a compromise which will give the best bill possible.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN) there were—ayes 20, noes 103.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. FORAND, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6287) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amend-

ments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the Smith amendment, page 3, line 2; I ask for a separate vote on the Budge amendment, page 4, line 18; I ask for a separate vote on the Smith amendment, page 5, line 8; I ask for a separate vote on the Murray amendment, page 11, line 7; I ask for a separate vote on the Andersen amendment on page 11, line 12; I ask for a separate vote on the Hébert amendment, page 11, lines 23 and 24; I ask for a separate vote on the Jonas amendment, page 13, line 7; I ask for a separate vote on the Dorn amendment, page 19, line 15; and a separate vote on the Fisher amendment, page 25, lines 1 to 4.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a separate vote on every amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

#### AUGUST J. STRIGGA

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2046) for the relief of August J. Strigga, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 11, and page 2, line 1, strike out "in excess of 10 percent thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, but for the information of the House, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts if these amendments have been agreed to by the minority members of the committee.

Mr. LANE. They have.

Mr. MARTIN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.



The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### MRS. JOHN WILLIAM BRENNAN

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1863) for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 10, after "Senior" insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### JAMES L. BOSTWICK

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 3322) for the relief of James L. Bostwick, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out all after "1955" over to and including "\$1,000" in line 5 on page 2.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### HOURLY MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request previously made to meet tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MURRAY. I object, Mr. Speaker.

#### EXTENSION, RECONSTRUCTION AND REPLACEMENT OF CENTRAL PORTION OF UNITED STATES CAPITOL

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Speaker, it is important that the House, in conducting its own affairs, set an example in the way of reducing expenditures and the drain upon the Treasury which comes with expenditures. The plans for extending the Capitol Building and for a new House Office Building and for remodeling existing buildings fall in that category. These two projects will run to about \$100 million before completion. I am introducing two resolutions today in an effort to obtain prompt study and report by committees consisting of members who have not heretofore been involved in those plans as to whether or not the two projects can be deferred. The amounts appropriated thus far and the amounts expended are set forth in the resolutions.

The two resolutions are as follows:

Whereas, on March 3, 1905 (H. Doc. No. 385 of the 58th Cong.), a joint commission of Congress reported a plan for the extension, reconstruction, and replacement of the central portion of the United States Capitol; and

Whereas the Congress by Public Law 242, 84th Congress, 1st session (pp. 17 and 18) authorized the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol, to provide for said extension, reconstruction and replacement in accordance with scheme B of the architectural plan aforesaid, with such modifications and additions as might be approved by said Commission; authorized \$5 million to remain available for such purposes until expended; and authorized the Architect of the Capitol, within specified limits, to enter into contracts and make expenditures necessary to carry out the purposes of the act and to "obligate the additional sums herein authorized prior to the actual appropriation thereof"; and

Whereas, by Public Law 406, 84th Congress, 2d session (p. 3), Congress amended said Public Law 242 by authorizing an appropriation of "such additional sums as may be determined by said Commission to be required for the purposes hereof"; and

Whereas the Congress, by Public Law 624, 84th Congress, 2d session, appropriated an additional \$12 million for use by the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of the Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol, to provide for the foregoing purposes; and

Whereas the total of \$17 million thus appropriated, \$8 million have been obligated and of said latter amount some \$4 million have been expended, and it is expected that the remainder of said \$17 million will be required for studies and plans and other actions necessary and preliminary to the preparation of specifications and contracts for the project; and

Whereas many Members of Congress have expressed their views that extension of the Capitol and other work contemplated by the portions of Public Law 242 and Public Law 624 above referred to should not be undertaken without further consideration by both Houses of Congress: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That a special joint committee of nine be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate to consider and report to said bodies as to whether or not it is necessary, and, if not necessary, is desirable, to proceed with said project at this time. The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate shall each appoint 4 members of said committee, 2 of whom shall be Republicans and 2 Democrats. No member of the committee shall be a member of the Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol. An additional member shall be agreed upon

and named jointly by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate to act as chairman of said special joint committee.

#### House Resolution —

Resolution to provide for the appointment of a special committee to investigate and report upon the need for a new House Office Building at this time

Whereas the Congress by Public Law 24, 84th Congress, 1st session (pp. 13 and 14), authorized the acquisition of sites and the construction of an additional fireproof office building for the use of the House of Representatives, and for the making of changes in existing House Office Buildings, all in accordance with the plans to be prepared by or under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol and the House Office Building Commission; appropriated \$5 million for said purposes and authorized the Architect of the Capitol, under the direction of said Commission to obligate additional sums prior to the actual appropriation thereof; and

Whereas Congress by Public Law 624, 84th Congress, 2d session (p. 11), appropriated an additional \$10 million; and

Whereas all of said \$15 million has been obligated for services preliminary to the placing of contracts for actual construction; and

Whereas the budget for fiscal 1958 contains an item of \$7,500,000 for additional preliminary work; and

Whereas many Members of the House of Representatives have expressed the desire that contracts for the construction of the new House Office Building, and for alterations in the existing buildings incidental to that construction, be deferred until later years:

*Resolved*, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives appoint a committee of five, no one of whom shall be a member of the commission above named, to consider and report to this House as to whether or not it is necessary, and, if not necessary, is in their judgment desirable to proceed further with said project at this time.

#### COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DAWSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, yesterday—coincident with the beginning of hearings before the House Appropriations Committee—my colleague from southern California introduced legislation to repeal the Colorado River storage project now under construction in Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico.

Hoping to take advantage of the laudable concern Members of this House have shown over the size of the Federal budget, he asks Congress to halt all construction and abandon a project upon which we already have spent \$9 million and which—and this is important—the residents of the four-State area to be benefited have promised to repay.

I sincerely hope that the membership of this body will see through this latest attempt by southern California to prevent four Western States from utilizing

their last major source of water—water that has been allocated to them by solemn compact of which California is a signatory State.

In support of his latest legislative attempt to wreck the greatest reclamation project in the history of this Nation, the gentleman from California renews objections that were thoroughly considered by the 84th Congress—thoroughly considered and found wanting.

He objects to the continued construction of Glen Canyon Dam on the basis that it will be used to store water. For the gentleman's information that is the purpose for which Congress authorized the dam and appropriated funds for its initial construction. Of course, we intend to store water in it and the sooner the better.

Basically the issue is: Shall the upper basin's share of the Colorado River water be put to consumptive use or shall it be used to furnish secondary power at dump power rates to a few favored southern California industries. There is no other issue.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California gives the impression in his statement that the initial filling of Glen Canyon Dam would seriously deplete the flow of the Colorado River "over a considerable period of time." There is no question that filling a dam cuts the flow of the river below that dam but the Colorado River compact provides that this flow cannot be cut below a certain figure. The legislation authorizing the Colorado project provides that it must be operated in conformity with the compact. The gentleman's fears are groundless.

He mentions the figure of 3 million acre-feet which will be backed up behind Glen Canyon during the initial phase of construction. That amount of water can be stored on a river the size of the Colorado in a period of 30 days. During this storage period, ample water will continue to be released to keep the operation of the dam within the terms of the compact.

The southern California Congressman in his address questioned the engineering of the dam. We members from the upper basin States can only wonder why southern California never questions the ability of the engineers of the Bureau of Reclamation when California projects are designed. Apparently the engineering ability of the Bureau—to which Hoover Dam is a monument—is deficient only if it is used to design dams to store water which otherwise would run through southern California to waste in the Pacific Ocean.

The appointment of a commission of independent engineers for Glen Canyon Dam is not new. It is standard procedure for every major reclamation project ever undertaken, to appoint such engineers to advise on construction after the contracts are let. An independent commission also was appointed during the construction of Hoover Dam.

Much has been said about the Bureau's tendency to underestimate costs of construction of its projects. The gentleman from southern California raised that question yesterday. For the information of the Members I herewith submit a

chart showing the Bureau's estimate and the actual bid amount on contracts let to date under the Colorado River Storage Project Act.

You will note on the chart that with the exception of the contract for a bridge, all bid prices were near or below the engineer's estimate. The bridge is a joint venture being financed by Arizona, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Bureau of Reclamation.

If the gentleman from California seeks to find a project which has not run from 30 to 50 percent higher than estimated costs he should look at the Upper Colorado River storage project.

#### Colorado River storage project

##### GLEN CANYON UNIT

Specification and job description	Contractor	Date awarded	Bid amount	Engineer's estimate
400C-63—Exploratory drilling and water testing at Glen Canyon damsite.	Cannon Diamond Drilling Co., Compton, Calif.	Aug. 14, 1956	\$148,185	\$172,820
DC-4747—Right diversion tunnel....	Mountain States Construction Co., Denver, Colo.	Oct. 1, 1956	2,452,340	3,845,100
DC-4730—Earthwork and culverts, access highway, station 15867 to station 4000.	Strong Co., Springville, Utah.....	Sept. 21, 1956	1,156,244	1,014,633
DC-4756—Earthwork and structures, station 40000 to station 149750 and Waterholes Canyon Bridge.	W. W. Clyde & Co., Springville, Utah.	Oct. 30, 1956	1,011,820	832,663
DC-4800—Colorado River bridge.....	Kiewit-Judson Pacific Murphy, Emeryville, Calif.	Jan. 21, 1957	4,129,277	2,944,750
409C-68—Completion of gravel surfacing, Arizona-Utah State line to Glen Canyon dam site and Wahweap Creek roads.	Ford-Fielding, Inc., Provo, Utah..	Nov. 8, 1956	26,801	73,220
Total.....			8,944,667	8,853,186
FLAMING GORGE UNIT				
DC-4779—Earthwork and structures, bridge and surfacing, access road, station 0+00 to station 402+00.	Wanggaard Construction Co., Logan, Utah.	Jan. 4, 1957	143,912	171,342
Total.....			9,088,579	9,054,528

NOTE.—For contracts let through January 1957 bids were \$34,051 or 0.4 percent greater than engineer's estimate.

#### INSURANCE PROBLEMS IN POTENTIAL ACCIDENT IN PRIVATE ENTERPRISE ATOMIC ENERGY ESTABLISHMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, early in 1953, the Atomic Energy Commission became concerned about the possibility of a catastrophic accident in the newly proposed private enterprise atomic energy establishments. A committee of outstanding insurance executives was appointed to make a close study of the insurance problems created by the expanded industrial participation in atomic energy installations and to make appropriate recommendations to the Atomic Energy Commission including legislation considered necessary.

This committee issued a preliminary report on July 13, 1955.

Among the recommendations of this group:

8. In order to promote the insurability of such enterprises and increase insurance capacity, it is believed absolutely necessary that the present Reactor Safeguards Committee or a similar committee continue to function and that stringent safety standards

Members will recall the hundreds of thousands of dollars spent by southern California during the past 3 years to defeat this project. They will recall the debate on this project in which the propaganda put out by southern California interests was thoroughly discredited.

The Upper Colorado storage project—along with Hoover Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and other great reclamation structures—will continue on schedule and within the next decade will be contributing its wealth of water and power to the well-being of an area and the prosperity of the Nation.

be maintained as a condition precedent to licensing under the 1954 act. This would involve periodic inspection as to compliance as a condition for the continuance of the license.

Because this committee said it is absolutely necessary that the Reactor Safeguards Committee continue to function, last week I introduced H. R. 6471, identical with the bill introduced in the Senate, S. 1684, by Senator ANDERSON of New Mexico, a leading expert in matters dealing both with atomic energy and insurance.

Senator ANDERSON said on introducing the bill:

We should strive to prevent, through every possible means, the occurrence of an atomic catastrophe which could cause widespread damage and set the atomic energy program back many years. We should establish procedures which are open to all, with a maximum of information disseminated as to the hazards and safety of each proposed design of a reactor, and as to the administrative considerations and actions taken on each application. The public has a substantial investment in the atomic energy program and has a right to know and analyze the steps being followed by administrative officials (p. 4093, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 21, 1957).



I can well imagine, Mr. Speaker, the reasons that motivated the introduction of this bill. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy had scheduled extensive hearings and the Atomic Energy Commission had complied with the request of the joint committee that it file a report entitled "Theoretical Consequences of a Large-Scale Nuclear Accident." This report says that, and I quote:

In the worst possible circumstances, property damage may total up to \$7 billion and that human tragedy will include killed and injured up to a distance of 45 miles.

In his testimony before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on March 2, Mr. Strauss says—at page 10—the figure relating to property damage "is largely due to assumed contamination of land with fission products."

Just yesterday Mr. Strauss held his first press conference in 18 months, in which he reported that three nuclear reactors are already built, 1 in 1951 and 2 in 1956. Three are under construction with a completion of one scheduled for this year, 1 scheduled for completion in 1958 and 1 in 1959. Four additional nuclear reactors are in advanced design for contemplated construction in this country with no completion date established. If only one of these reactors experience an incident, Mr. Strauss himself advised the Congress that the reactor being built on Lake Erie is "the most hazardous of all reactors" then, under this proposal the Federal Government would be liable for a greater sum of damage claims than the total which our friends on the other side of the aisle are attempting to cut from the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, if this reactor is so hazardous that Mr. Strauss and other witnesses can come down here and tell the Congress that \$500 million worth of liability is inadequate and that an unlimited amount of liability is necessary, I say, Mr. Speaker, this reactor is too dangerous for testing near a populated center.

This reactor is being subsidized by the Atomic Energy Commission. According to reports, this \$10 million is being supplemented by a premium price on the plutonium being produced of over \$36 million. In other words, Mr. Speaker, this reactor which has a total cost of approximately \$43 million is receiving a Federal Government subsidy of \$46 million and yet, the president of this company comes to the Congress and asks for approximately \$500 million insurance on this reactor, even though construction is going ahead against the advice of the AEC's own Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about another aspect of this proposal. Following the issuance of the task force preliminary report of the insurance study group, the insurance industry has formed two funds to provide a basic minimum from the insurance industry. This coverage totals \$65 million. Mr. Speaker, if I read the hearings correctly, when Admiral Strauss testified on behalf of the administration, he proposed certain changes in the pending

bills which eliminate the responsibility for payment of the \$65 million base liability and require the Federal Government to pay the total damage under certain circumstances. Witnesses were questioned very closely on this aspect by one of the most informed experts on insurance in the Senate of the United States, Senator ANDERSON. Each witness questioned confirmed the fact that, under the conditions described, the Federal Government would pay the total damage and the insurance industry would be absolved of all liability. I do not understand how such a proposal could possibly be made. If there are those who feel this bill will go sailing through the Congress without any concern by the responsible Members as to the effect it would have on the budget or the national debt of the United States, they are mistaken. If these reactors are so hazardous, can we not test them, as was the prototype for the *Nautilus*, in a remote location until we know enough about them to put them near or even in our cities without creating the need for such extensive insurance as is requested in these pending bills and by this kind of testimony?

I make these remarks, Mr. Speaker, to call attention of the Members of the House to this matter which is so vitally important to large segments of our Nation's population.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VANIK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ASHLEY. I commend the gentleman on a very perceptive statement. As a Representative from the Toledo community, I share the concern the gentleman feels with respect to the breeder type reactor which is proposed for the Laguna Beach project which is currently under construction. I am interested in what the gentleman has to say, particularly since he comes from Cleveland, which I suppose is 150 miles or more from the Laguna Beach project. Does the gentleman have any facts relative to the damage which might be incurred if a catastrophe struck the Laguna Beach project as far as the citizens whom he represents in Cleveland are concerned?

Mr. VANIK. In reply to the gentleman, I want to point out that the city of Cleveland is probably a little more than 110 miles from this proposed site over the lake. Cleveland is in the direct path of prevailing winds which would pass over the site and which would conceivably reach the Cleveland area. While the expert testimony has indicated an immediate range of 45 miles as the hazard area, I do not believe the evidence at all excludes the possibility of contaminating the waters of Lake Erie and contaminating the air which passes over the city of Cleveland, flowing in a direct southeasterly direction from this site. I think we are in an area where we should be concerned, although I think our concern is perhaps more removed and somewhat more remote than it is for the citizens of Toledo who are immediately adjacent to the site on the south.

Mr. ASHLEY. I take it the gentleman is in no way opposed to the peacetime

development of atomic energy at the Laguna Beach site or even closer to Cleveland, if and when that time ever comes. What the gentleman is opposed to, I take it, is this development or installation of this particular type of reactor at the Laguna Beach project; is that correct?

Mr. VANIK. That is a correct statement. I feel the establishment of the so-called hot breeder type reactor in this area is one that should have been located in a more remote area until it has been thoroughly tested and until safeguards have been established, and until we might have had some experience with the kind of development contemplated. It seems to me it was certainly unwise for the Commission to authorize this type reactor in so highly a populated area.

Mr. ASHLEY. I am in complete concurrence with the gentleman's position on this matter. I think it might be of interest to you to know that on January 16 of this year, I wrote to the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM, expressing the interest and concern of the constituents of my district in Toledo, Ohio, regarding the application of the Detroit Edison Co., known as the Power Reactor Development Co., to construct a fast breeder nuclear powerplant at Laguna Beach, Mich.

I noted in that letter that Detroit Edison was requesting public insurance to indemnify for loss of life and property damage resulting from a nuclear plant accident. Subsequently, I had a reply from the chairman of the joint committee to the effect that it has been and will continue to be vitally interested in all questions affecting the public health and safety.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this House know from the report and the hearings issued by the Appropriations Committee last July that the AEC's own Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards had considered the design proposed by the Detroit Edison Co. and rejected it.

After the Congress adjourned, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, who had announced that he was going to a ground-breaking ceremony early in June, granted the permit to the Detroit Edison Co. to proceed with the construction, even though his own Advisory Committee recommended against it.

The chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy issued a statement in protest. Senator CLINTON ANDERSON said in part:

4. From a practical standpoint, AEC might feel obligated to go on through with a bad deal with respect to public safety because they will have permitted the expenditure of huge sums under the construction permit. It is my belief that decisions on safety should be made without any examination of dollars involved but only from the standpoint of human lives.

When queried about this problem before the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Strauss said on July 3, 1956, that he was waiting for the Congress to enact the insurance legislation before the Atomic Energy Commission would consider the safety problem of the Detroit Edison design.

As we know, bills have been introduced in the Congress asking for unlimited accident insurance in the event of a reactor blowup.

Mr. Speaker, I note that on March 21, Senator ANDERSON took the above considerations into account when he introduced a bill to protect the public from decisions made on the basis of the dollars involved rather than from the standpoint of human lives.

Mr. Speaker, I am impressed with the purpose and action taken by the Senator from New Mexico in this regard and I have, therefore, introduced today in the House an identical bill. This bill provides for amendment of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to require the establishment of a Committee on Reactor Safeguards with a maximum of 15 members. This committee shall have the obligation to review safety studies and facility license applications for all power reactors referred to it by the AEC.

The committee shall advise the Commission with regard to the hazards of the proposed reactor facilities and the adequacy of the proposed safety standards. All reports of the committee shall be made public. Following the publication of these reports, the AEC is required to issue notice in the Federal Register regarding contemplated action on any license application. After 30 days of such notice, the Commission is required to hold a public hearing.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the purpose of this bill to the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and hope that early hearings may be held. Passage of this measure I am sure will be for the protection and benefit of the residents of Toledo and other areas whose very lives depend upon progress and safety going hand in hand.

#### HOPKINTON-EVERETT PROJECT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and place in the RECORD a letter received by me from General Fleming.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter from General Fleming, of the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, Office of the Division of Engineers, New England. He says:

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,  
UNITED STATES ARMY,  
OFFICE OF THE DIVISION ENGINEER,  
Boston, Mass., March 29, 1957.  
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In accordance with our telephone conversation, I am pleased to fur-

nish you with information concerning the Hopkinton-Everett project.

The Merrimack River problem is the greatest unsolved flood control puzzle in New England. Fortunately, the construction of the Hopkinton-Everett project is the key to its solution. If the 1936 and 1938 floods were to recur today the flood damages would exceed \$74 million in New Hampshire and \$140 million in Massachusetts. The operation of Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir together with the flood-control reservoirs already built would prevent 85 percent of the damage in New Hampshire and 70 percent in Massachusetts.

Although \$50,000 in planning funds was provided this fiscal year for Hopkinton-Everett no money could be used until concurrence in the project had been given by the State of New Hampshire. Due to this lack of concurrence at the time our budget requests were submitted it was impossible to request funds for this project for fiscal year 1958.

As you know, recent favorable action by the New Hampshire Legislature gave Governor Dwinell necessary authority to commit the State of New Hampshire to the project. Immediately upon the removal of the legal roadblock Governor Dwinell wrote to me giving the formal concurrence of the State of New Hampshire. This cleared the way for initiation of planning which is now getting under way.

When a project is authorized we develop a tentative schedule for surveys, planning, and construction, which is revised from year to year. This schedule is made up without any reference to other projects in the division, the total civil works program, or other program needs of the Government, or the availability of men or equipment generally in any 1 year. It, therefore, is a figure for internal planning purposes only. That figure for this project is \$600,000 for fiscal year 1958 and would include planning and some funds for limited real estate acquisition. For your further information the President has directed that our fiscal year 1958 expenditures as estimated in his budget presented to the Congress, be considered as the maximum that can be made within the overall fiscal policies of the administration for that year. Since no funds are included in the budget for the Hopkinton-Everett project, no funds can be utilized for this project and meet the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,  
ROBERT J. FLEMING, Jr.,  
Brigadier General, United States Army,  
Division Engineer.

Mr. Speaker, there are \$50,000 in planning funds that the engineers can already use in 1957 but they need, according to General Fleming, \$600,000 for plans and certain land purchases for the fiscal year 1958. There is nothing in the budget for 1958 because at the time the budget was made up the compact between New Hampshire and Massachusetts had not been signed which would approve of the plan. The authorization already exists for the flood-control map and the compact already signed by them does not have to be approved by the Congress, although that formality will be prolonged by cost hazards; the authorization to go ahead with the projects already exists.

I understand that a committee of the Senate today approved the compact between New Hampshire and Massachu-

setts, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] has a compact to be approved by the Public Works Committee of the House. The gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERRILL] and I introduced companion bills, H. R. 6437 and H. R. 6438, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee has promised us a hearing on those bills which provide for an appropriation of \$800,000 for Merrimack River projects.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the invocation of the gentlewoman from Indiana which she delivered at the dinner of 1,500 cheering Republican women last night be placed in the RECORD on Thursday. It was a very beautiful invocation. The gentlewoman is a great Christian as well as a fine legislator.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the hysteria of economy which has swept the Congress apparently is based on a tremendous lot of misinformation that is being spread throughout the country by newspapers which has published many articles and have advised their people to write their Congressman. One chain of newspapers which I will refer to as the Knight newspapers being owned by an individual and his family by the name of Knight, has recently published a lot of suggested cuts for the Congress to make and has said that in case the Congress does not know how to cut the budget this newspaper will give the Congress advice on how to cut it.

One glaring misconception which they have was printed in their newspaper. It said that they noted that the Congress pays something like \$16,500 a year to a man to keep the door, a doorkeeper; and they went on at some length to show what an unjustified expense this was.

They referred, of course, to our Doorkeeper, William M. Miller, whom many of us affectionately address as "Fish-bait," a nickname of affection. I just want to call to the attention of this list of papers and its readers—and I hope that my remarks will be printed by them, although my hope is probably ill-founded—that the position of Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives dates back from the 2d day of the 1st session of the 1st Congress, whereby the House of Representatives resolved that "a Doorkeeper and an Assistant Doorkeeper be appointed for the service of this House." This action took place on March 5, 1789.



The Library of Congress has furnished on request a list of the names of the doorkeepers who have served since that time, including our present Doorkeeper, Mr. William M. Miller, of Mississippi.

I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in my remarks, Mr.

Speaker; and I also ask unanimous consent that the duties of the Doorkeeper be printed here. I note that in addition to many tasks which the House has put upon his shoulders that he supervises between 250 and 300 employees. I ask unanimous consent that these two

additional compilations of material be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to follows:)

*Doorkeepers of the House of Representatives*

Congress	Year	Doorkeeper	State	Congress	Year	Doorkeeper	State
1st	1789	Gifford Dalley		44th	1875	John H. Patterson	New Jersey
2d	1791	do		45th	1877	Charles W. Field	Georgia
3d	1793	do		46th	1879	do	Do.
4th	1795	Thomas Claxton		47th	1881	Walter P. Brownlow	Tennessee
5th	1797	do		48th	1883	James W. Wintersmith	Texas
6th	1799	do		49th	1885	Samuel Donaldson	Tennessee
7th	1801	do		50th	1887	A. B. Hurd	Mississippi
8th	1803	do		51st	1889	Charles E. Adams	Maryland
9th	1805	do		52d	1891	Charles H. Turner	New York
10th	1807	do		53d	1893	A. B. Hurd	Mississippi
11th	1809	do		54th	1895	William J. Glenn	New York
12th	1811	do		55th	1897	do	Do.
13th	1813	do		56th	1899	do	Do.
14th	1815	do		57th	1901	Frank B. Lyon	Do.
15th	1817	do		58th	1903	do	Do.
16th	1819	do		59th	1905	do	Do.
17th	1821	Benjamin Birch	Maryland	60th	1907	do	Do.
18th	1823	do	Do.	61st	1909	do	Do.
19th	1825	do	Do.	62d	1911	Joseph J. Sinnott	Virginia
20th	1827	do	Do.	63d	1913	do	Do.
21st	1829	do	Do.	64th	1915	do	Do.
22d	1831	Overton Carr	Do.	65th	1917	do	Do.
23d	1833	do	Do.	66th	1919	Bert W. Kennedy	Michigan
24th	1835	do	Do.	67th	1921	do	Do.
25th	1837	do	Do.	68th	1923	do	Do.
26th	1839	Joseph Follansbee	Massachusetts	69th	1925	do	Do.
27th	1841	do	Do.	70th	1927	do	Do.
28th	1843	Jesse E. Dow	Connecticut	71st	1929	do	Do.
29th	1845	Cornelius S. Whitney	Washington, D. C.	72d	1931	Joseph J. Sinnott	Virginia
30th	1847	Robert E. Horner	New Jersey	73d	1933	do	Do.
31st	1849	do	Do.	74th	1935	do	Do.
32d	1851	Z. W. McKew	Maryland	75th	1937	do	Do.
33d	1853	do	Do.	76th	1939	do	Do.
34th	1855	Nathan Darling	New York	77th	1941	do	Do.
35th	1857	Robert B. Hackney	Virginia	78th	1943	do	Do.
36th	1859	George Marston	New Hampshire			Ralph R. Roberts	Indiana
37th	1861	Ira Goodnow	Vermont			do	Do.
38th	1863	do	Do.	79th	1945	do	Do.
39th	1865	do	Do.	80th	1947	M. L. Meletio	Missouri
40th	1867	Charles E. Lippincott	Illinois	81st	1949	William M. Miller	Mississippi
41st	1869	Otis S. Buxton	New York	82d	1951	do	Do.
42d	1871	do	Do.	83d	1953	Tom Kennamer	Missouri
43d	1873	do	Do.	84th	1955	William M. Miller	Mississippi

Source: De Alva Stanwood Alexander's History and Procedure of the House of Representatives, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1916. Pp. 396-397. CONGRESSIONAL

RECORDS, 62d-84th Congs.

**DUTIES OF THE DOORKEEPER**

The Doorkeeper has supervision over the following departments, which are a part of the machinery that helps keep Congress in operation:

1. Messengers to the Doorkeeper.
2. House pages.
3. Three barber shops.
4. Three ladies' retiring rooms.
5. Document room.
6. Janitor service.
7. Two cloakrooms, lunch counters.
8. Two cloakrooms, 28 telephones.
9. Folding room.
10. Wastepaper baling machine.

The Doorkeeper makes all the many necessary arrangements for a joint session of Congress. Such as issuing tickets to each Member of the House and Senate, the White House, the Cabinet, the Supreme Court, and all radio, periodical, television, newsreel, and still photographers.

The Doorkeeper announces to the House the arrival of dignitaries (and others when there is a joint meeting or a joint session) and the arrival of messages in writing from the President of the United States and the other body.

The Doorkeeper supervises the initial issuing of all House gallery passes.

The Doorkeeper is responsible for the orderly way in which all newspapers are placed on the racks in the Speaker's lobby.

The Doorkeeper must keep up with or ahead of the legislative action that takes place on the House floor, so that he may be able to give an intelligent answer when any Member asks him about such procedures.

The Doorkeeper must enforce strictly the rules relating to the privileges of the Hall and be responsible to the House for the official conduct of his employees.

The Doorkeeper at the commencement and close of each session of Congress shall take an inventory of all the furniture, books, and other public property under his charge, and report the same to the House, which report shall be referred to the Committee on House Administration to ascertain and determine the amount for which he shall be held liable for missing articles.

The Doorkeeper shall allow no person to enter the room over the Hall of the House during its sittings; and 15 minutes before the hour of the meeting of the House each day he shall see that the floor is cleared of all persons except those privileged to remain, and kept so until 10 minutes after adjournment.

While the Speaker is putting a question or addressing the House no Member shall walk out of or across the Hall, nor, when a Member is speaking, pass between him and the Chair; and during the session of the House no Member shall wear his hat or remain by the Clerk's desk during the call of the roll or the counting of ballots, or smoke upon the floor of the House; and the Sergeant at Arms and the Doorkeeper are charged with the strict enforcement of this clause.

The Doorkeeper and his assistants are responsible for the keeping of the doors of the House of Representatives, both the floor level and the gallery level.

The Doorkeeper and his assistants are to close all doors (floor level) during a quorum call.

The present Doorkeeper assists the majority leader in preparing the whip notice for the coming week.

The present Doorkeeper has been elected as the Doorkeeper for the Democratic caucus for the 85th Congress.

The Doorkeeper sees that all rules and regulations of the House are obeyed and order is maintained in the galleries. Such as no packages, bundles, cameras, suitcases, or briefcases are allowed in the galleries. Standing or sitting in the doorways and aisles, smoking, applause, reading, taking notes, taking of photographs, and the wearing of hats by men are prohibited. No hats, coats, or other objects may be placed on the railings; visitors are prohibited from leaning forward over the railings or placing their hands thereon.

The Doorkeeper advises all Democratic Members in the Speaker's lobby and in the dining room the bill or amendment being voted on, whenever the occasion arises.

The present Doorkeeper sends out all Democratic caucus notices.

The present Doorkeeper has been in the past, and expects to be in the future, the Doorkeeper at the Democratic National Convention.

**AID FOR ORCHARDISTS IN EASTERN OREGON**

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from California [Mr. ULLMAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced two bills which are designed to aid a group of orchardists in eastern Oregon who were the unfortunate victims of a severe and unprecedented freeze. It is my understanding that similar legislation will be introduced by Senator MORSE and Senator NEUBERGER.

This freeze, which occurred in December of 1955 in the Milton-Freewater area of Umatilla County, was of disaster proportions. It caused the complete destruction of practically all of Umatilla County's 4,558 acres of prune, apple, peach, and sweet cherry trees.

The orchards in this area were among the finest in the Nation. The industry was built up and operated by skillful farmers who had fine reputations for industry, resourcefulness, and financial responsibility. They and their industry were a credit to the area in which they lived and to the State in general. Yet, overnight, and without the slightest fault on their part, farmers who had established and maintained a thriving fresh-fruit industry found their source of livelihood wiped out.

I have personally inspected the freeze-stricken orchard area and I am fully aware of the fact that the damage suffered by the orchardists is enormous. Certainly the devastation which has occurred is as extensive as that which has been caused through major floods and droughts in other localities for which Federal assistance has been made available.

Mr. Speaker, this is an area well suited to the production of fresh fruit and one which I believe should be restored. Moreover, I firmly believe that it should be restored in such a way that the family-sized farm, which has been the basic farm unit in the area, be maintained. We have become increasingly aware that the effects of disasters which occur through no fault of individuals must be mitigated in certain instances through Federal assistance. I submit that the orchard area in my district is such an instance.

In conjunction with the two Senators from Oregon, Senator MORSE and Senator NEUBERGER, I have brought this matter to the attention of the Department of Agriculture, and in particular to the attention of the Soil Conservation Service and the Farmers' Home Administration. We have held conferences and exchanged a good deal of correspondence. A limited amount of progress has been made through these efforts. Yet, the Department of Agriculture still maintains that it does not have the authority to provide the type of financial assistance which is needed if this area is again to be restored as a productive industry and source of income.

The Department of Agriculture has expressed its willingness, if funds are made available through the enactment of the Senate version of the urgent deficiency appropriation bill, to assist, on the basis of a cost-sharing arrangement, in the removal of dead trees, leveling of land and seedbed preparation. They have refused, however, to make such an

arrangement applicable for the replanting of nursery stock. Moreover, the Department of Agriculture has categorically refused to make the cost-sharing arrangement applicable to work which has already been done or work which is now in progress.

We, of course, appreciate this limited form of aid. But, unfortunately, it is not sufficient to rehabilitate the fresh-fruit industry in the Milton-Freewater area. Anyone familiar with orchard cultivation is aware that it takes from 5 to 8 years after planting of nursery stock before any fruit crop can be harvested. During that period there is, of course, no income. Farmers Home Administration has stated that loans could be made available to orchardists but only with the understanding that repayment would begin 2 years after the loan was granted. I submit that such an arrangement is of little assistance in the disaster area of eastern Oregon. It is clearly impossible for repayment of loans to be made until a fruit crop is ready for marketing, and this, of course, would not occur for 6 to 10 crop years.

Mr. Speaker, we have exhausted every possibility of obtaining satisfactory action from the Department of Agriculture. Reluctantly, we have reached the conclusion that it is only through the enactment of legislation that needed aid can be obtained for the disaster area. It is for this reason that I have today introduced this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation which I am proposing is in the form of two bills. The first of these bills would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make emergency loans to eligible orchard operators and owners in areas which have been declared production disaster areas. Under the terms of this proposed legislation, an orchard operator would be eligible for assistance if (a) he has suffered substantial financial losses, (b) he has any need of financial assistance which he cannot obtain through private credit sources on such terms and conditions as he can reasonably be expected to meet, and (c) he has a good chance of repaying it.

Initial repayment installments would be deferred until income could reasonably be expected from the orchards. Provision is also made for refinancing of existing secured or unsecured indebtedness of orchard operations.

This proposed legislation limits the amount which can be outstanding for orchard loans at any one time to a total of \$10 million. I believe that this amount will provide sufficient funds to initiate this program and, of course, can be increased if expansion of the program is needed in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the second bill which I have today introduced would amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act so as to authorize the inclusion in agricultural conservation programs of activities carried out in connection with the reestablishment of orchards destroyed by production disasters. Enactment of such legislation would authorize a cost-sharing arrangement for purposes of preparing the orchard land and for

the purpose of purchasing nursery stock for replanting. The cost-sharing arrangement would be made applicable to work which has been done on the orchard lands from the time at which the Secretary of Agriculture declared the region to be a production disaster area.

Mr. Speaker, there is an urgent need for prompt enactment of this legislation. These orchardists have been waiting since the freeze occurred at the end of 1955. They have done what they could to again prepare their land for replanting. But as is the case with any major disaster, the victims seldom have sufficient funds to repair the damage and destruction wrought by such disaster. During the past few weeks, I received numerous letters from the orchardists in this area. In closing, I ask that the text of some of these letters be included in my statement for I believe they express far more adequately than I can the need for this legislation:

MILTON-FREEWATER, OREG., March 9, 1957.  
Congressman AL ULLMAN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I want to thank you for the fast action you got for help in the flood damage done in eastern Oregon the past few weeks. I hope you come out as well in your efforts to obtain help for the fruit growers in Milton-Freewater. Help will have to come very soon now or a good many farmers will lose another year in getting their farms in production again.

As you know, a good many farmers are either too old to go out and work and take care of their farms, or they are like myself and just have too much farm to allow taking on an outside job. I am farming about 50 acres of fruit land and I work out a day now and then but it is impossible to work out very much. Our land is not suitable for anything much but fruit. Hoping you can do something for us. I thank you.

Sincerely yours,

WALLACE F. BULLOCK.

MARCH 13, 1957.  
Congressman AL ULLMAN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: For some time the Milton-Freewater disaster committee has been seeking assistance for the fruit farmers of this area. Many men have worked long and diligently for this. We feel that the time has now come to inform you of our individual situations. It is our fervent hope that you will be kind enough to read our letter and give it the consideration we feel you should. Please bear in mind as you read that we would prefer talking with you personally but that is obviously impossible, so we must resort to a letter.

We are, we feel, rather typical of the small farmers of the area. We farm 11 acres of which we had an orchard. Five acres were mature prune trees, and six acres were young apples, just coming into production. We had spent the biggest part of our returns on the prunes to bring the apple trees to bearing age, and had just harvested the first apples from them the fall before the disastrous freeze. The better varieties of trees, such as the Red King apple cost about \$1.25 apiece. It is considered by many to be the preferred apple for this area. This with an eye to coming market trends and maturing conditions of the valley. Planting distances vary with personal theory, but it usually takes, including replacements, around 125 trees to the acre. It is very obvious the expense we face when we try to replace these orchards. Sadly enough the expenses don't



cease with the initial planting cost. These trees require constant care. They must be sprayed (an expensive proposition, requiring both material and equipment), fertilized (another expensive item), cleaned about, watered, and pruned to the proper shape. The fast majority of these are slow tedious jobs that must be done meticulously in order to achieve success. Please bear in mind as you consider this matter that it will be from 7 to 10 years before we harvest a commercial crop, and that from the time the trees are planted.

We do not feel we are asking for the moon, but rather an opportunity to be once more self-supporting and independent. We're sure you realize the gravity of the matter and are writing only because without your help we face a more or less degree of extinction.

Hoping to hear favorably from Washington, we remain,

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. R. RAY CARTER.

MILTON-FREEWATER, OREG.

MILTON-FREEWATER, OREG., March 17, 1957.

Congressman AL ULLMAN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: When you were in this area during the recent campaign, you had a chance to see and learn of the disaster caused by the freeze in the winter of 1955-56. Although you know of the farmers' condition in this regard and have been trying to help, which we greatly appreciate, perhaps we, too, could help ourselves more by informing you of some of our individual problems in this matter.

I have a 30-acre farm which was all in fruit and which was completely lost due to the freeze. Fortunately I did own the farm so I did not feel the effects financially until last summer when the job of cleaning up the place and getting it ready for replanting began. Now it will take more than I can afford just to get new trees planted.

Once the new trees are in it will take at least 8 to 10 years before any profitable crop is realized from them. During this time the trees must be cared for: Sprayed, pruned, irrigated, etc. Perhaps the biggest expense is the spraying because of the equipment involved. This equipment will have to be maintained and, most probably, replaced before 10 years. Another large expense is the necessity of hiring help in rebuilding my orchard and nursing it to maturity. Thirty acres may not seem large in comparison to many farms but with fruit it is not small and is more than one man can handle.

I feel, therefore, that it is essential to have some financial grant to pay the cost of clearing the old orchard and replanting a new one. I understand Congress has been working on some type of grant but wish to express my personal opinion on its necessity. Much of our work has been stalled due to lack of money which will in turn delay us from getting a complete orchard replanted. It is also necessary that such a grant be made available for at least two seasons due to the fact that at this time trees are in such demand it is impossible for all of us to get the types of trees we need.

Since this type of crop is not like other farm crops where one works from year to year for each crop, it should be obvious to anyone, farmer or otherwise, that it is impossible to live and stay in business with no income for 8 or 10 years and still have regular yearly expenses to meet. It should also be obvious to anyone that a short-time loan in this matter would be profitable to no one and even unacceptable because it would be impossible to repay it before the trees start producing. Unless a long-term loan of some type can be worked out, the idea is useless.

Some would think a farmer could get another job to support himself during these years of rebuilding. I certainly wish this were true as I would be the first to take another job while the trees grow; but, unfortunately, this is not the case. Trees require continuous care and attention from the time they are planted until the day they are replaced. In fact, as I have already mentioned, this work not only requires that I stay on the farm but that I also have at least one man helping me.

I have tried to show you by mentioning some of the problems which affect all fruit farmers in this circumstance, the necessity of some grant available now and next season for those who could not complete their replanting this year, and for a long-term loan to help in the years of waiting for the first crop. Without it most of us will be forced to sell our farms or try to start something new which, too, would require aid.

I truly hope you can help us in this matter. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

WALTER HERMANN.

MILTON-FREEWATER, OREG., March 9, 1957.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: Milton-Freewater Disaster Committee has asked each one of us to write you in regard to reproducing our orchards which will require 7 years to get back in production. We have 28 acres. I have figured it will cost \$200 per acre to take out the old orchard and reset it. To raise the orchard up to 7 years, I figure it will cost at least \$100 per acre a year, which includes taxes, spraying, fertilizing, cultivation, pruning, and irrigation. This work I would be able to do myself with the aid of this assistance. This much work would keep me at home and I don't have any outside income, which certainly is a problem with a family to support.

Hoping this will be given serious consideration.

Yours very truly,

W. J. MILLER.

MILTON-FREEWATER, OREG., March 9, 1957.

Congressman AL ULLMAN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: I feel that your efforts in behalf of the fruitgrowers of the valley is commendable and I sincerely hope that you obtain your objective. In the nearly 50 years we have been here this is one of the most disastrous things that has come our way. In our own case, we had just got our orchard into a profitable bearing stage. We had no real old trees and they were all at a profitable bearing stage. We were faced with the problem of orchard removal and replacement which is no small expense. The least figure we can consider will amount to over \$200 per acre. After that there is a long wait of over 7 years before we have any profitable commercial production. We do not feel that we are asking anything unreasonable when we bid for a grant for tree replacement. Further aid in a loan policy by the FHA tailored to fit our needs for further help will be a very necessary complement. For over a term of years it will cost \$1 a tree or \$100 per acre to pay taxes, irrigation fees, cultivation, and pruning of each acre of trees without considering what the owner is going to live on during that period of waiting. It has often been asked why we cannot change to some other crop that will produce quicker returns with more modern replacement costs. Anyone who has been over the district and seen what our soil formation is can surely understand that our land is of little value for anything but fruit trees. You have to see how rocky our soil is to get a true picture of its possibilities. It is also true that this

particular soil formation produces the finest quality of fruit. This is a well recognized fact in the trade as to the quality of our prunes, apples, and cherries.

Hoping you will continue your efforts until you obtained your objective in our behalf, I remain,

Yours truly,

P. S. GIBBONS, Sr.

MILTON-FREEWATER, OREG.,

March 10, 1957.

Congressman AL ULLMAN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: I own 20 acres of land in the disaster zone of Milton-Freewater.

We are trying hard to replant 1,000 trees. To do that we are going to have an expense of \$1,750.

It will take 7 years until a profitable production. We surely appreciate any and all efforts made by you before the Congress in our behalf. Thank you so much. May the Lord bless you.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. F. A. FEIGNER.

MILTON-FREEWATER, OREG.,

March 18, 1957.

Congressman AL ULLMAN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: I am writing you in regard to our situation here in the Walla Walla Valley since the freeze of 1955. I had 8½ acres of fine orchard and lost everything as many others did and it left most everyone in financial straits. So I hope you will do your utmost in helping to set up some sort of financial aid to help the farmers to get their trees replanted and other expenses that will be incurred in the 9 or 10 years that it will take to get the orchards back into full production.

Hoping you help out in this time of need, I am,

Yours respectfully,

W. M. BREWER.

MILTON-FREEWATER, OREG.,

March 8, 1957.

Congressman AL ULLMAN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ULLMAN: I am one of the farmers who lost a fruit farm in the 1955 freeze. True I have the land, but when you put in many years to raise an orchard so as to have an income for the time when you are unable to farm anymore (I am nearly 64 years old) and when you see everything wiped out overnight with no chance to salvage anything, it hurts.

Many other farmers about 4,300 acres, in fact our total fruit industry, was destroyed through no fault of ours and no finances to get back in a position alone where we can take ourselves out of a position of accepting charity. We feel we are, after these many years of hard work, entitled to help from our Government and are sure that you and our other folks there from Oregon will see to it that we do get the help we need to carry on.

Thank you. I remain yours,

FRANK B. RITCHEY.

REQUESTING PRESIDENT TO ADVISE CONGRESS WHERE REDUCTIONS COULD BE MADE IN EXECUTIVE BUDGET

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we all remember a few weeks ago that the House, on pretty much a party vote, passed the resolution requesting President Eisenhower to let Congress know where if any reductions could be made in the executive budget that he had sent to Congress. The House, to date, has not received any official reply from President Eisenhower. His recognition of the adoption of the House resolution was the comment he made in a press conference which indicated that he was not going to respond to the resolution. However, in the motion to recommit the Republican Members of the House made the same request, in substance, of the President as requested in the House resolution reported out of the Committee on Appropriations.

In connection with whether or not the President was going to respond officially to the House resolution some interesting questions were asked by me of the Director of the Budget, Hon. Percival F. Brundage, when he appeared on March 27, last, before the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the House Committee on Government Operations. The following questions were asked by me of Mr. Brundage and the following answers were given by him:

Mr. McCORMACK. You have been reviewing with agency heads now the 1958 budget, haven't you?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Has the review been finished, Mr. Brundage?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. No, sir.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a result of the reviews to date, have any of the agencies told you or have you told them where cuts can be made in the 1958 budget?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. Well, we are right in the middle of it yet, Mr. McCORMACK. It was in connection with our review that the decision of Mr. Cole in housing was made not to ask for the full authority which we had included in the budget.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words, it was a decision of the Director of the Budget that Mr. Cole acted on?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. No; it was as a result of our review with him that he decided—we have asked all of the agencies to go over every one of their requests again in detail for every program, and he decided that in the light of the present construction, the shortage of labor, material, money, and equipment, that it would be wise to postpone or cut down the request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is he the only one to date that you know of?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. Well, that is the only one that as yet has come up. We are working on several others.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, when do you expect to get through with the reviewing with the agency heads?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. Well, I don't know. It will take several weeks yet.

Mr. McCORMACK. Do you intend to let Congress know the results?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. I don't believe it has been decided yet as to whether each department head will introduce it or whether it will be done by the President. We have to decide what we can do and how much is involved, I think.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is a fair proposition to let Congress know, while the executive

budget is pending, where reductions could be made upon review; isn't it?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. We are going to try to get it up just as soon as we can.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it is fair for Congress to make that request?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Sure. And, as far as you know, the President, either through himself or through you, is going to let Congress know of any reduction that can be made in the 1958 budget as a result of these reviews that are taking place?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. Either himself or through his department; yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. So we can rely on that.

Mr. BRUNDAGE. We aren't trying to keep anything away from you, I assure you.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wasn't intimating that.

Mr. BRUNDAGE. I wish I knew more clearly about it myself. It is an awfully tough problem. We have gone over this thing several times already.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, when the Secretary of the Treasury repudiates the President's own budget, it is tough all around.

Mr. BRUNDAGE. Well, we combed this over originally when the forecast was made last summer before the guidelines were set and then we went through it again in the fall and we have gone over it again now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Well, you think the budget the President set up was a tight budget; don't you?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. I said I thought it was a very well balanced budget taking into consideration the needs of the country for protection, the services which the people want. I still think so.

Mr. McCORMACK. In other words you stand by the budget setup?

Mr. BRUNDAGE. Yes; he did.

It will be noted from the answers of Mr. Brundage that first, he considers the request of Congress for the information contained in the House resolution was a fair one; second, that either himself—meaning the President—or through his department, the President should let the Congress know of any reduction that can be made in the 1958 budget as a result of reviews that have taken place; third, that Director Brundage considers the President's budget to be "a very well balanced budget"; and fourth, that he—Director Brundage—stands behind the budget setup.

In view of the frank admission made by Director Brundage that the President himself, or through his department, would let Congress know of any reduction that can be made in the 1958 budget as the result of reviews, it will be interesting to know if such action is taken by the President. It does seem that Mr. Brundage is sufficiently high enough himself in the executive branch of our Government and close enough to the President to represent his views and to make a commitment that would be binding upon President Eisenhower.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. VANIK for 10 minutes today and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts for 10 minutes today.

Mr. ULLMAN for 10 minutes today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MINSHALL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FOGARTY to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUDGE to revise and extend his remarks in Committee and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROWNSON and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VORYS and to include a speech he made.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina.

Mr. ASHLEY (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and include related matter.

Mr. ABBITT and to include related matter.

Mr. SHELLEY in two instances in each to include related matter.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 4, 1957, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

694. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Col. Joseph T. Clement, United States Army, retired, and Brig. Gen. Waldo Charles Potter, United States Army, retired"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

695. A letter from the Deputy Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to clarify the law relating to the acceptance of business reply cards and letters in business reply envelopes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

696. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 19, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Sacramento River (Harbor), Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted May 10, 1945; to the Committee on Public Works.

697. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 19, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Sacramento River and tributaries (debris control, Bear River), Calif., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted July 28, 1939; to the Committee on Public Works.

698. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated October 19, 1956, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on and



preliminary examination and survey of Lake Washington Ship Canal and Ballard Locks, Washington, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 9, 1939, and authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

699. A letter from the Chairman, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "a bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. J. Res. 230. Joint Resolution to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to personnel employed by the House Committee on Ways and Means in connection with the investigations ordered by House Resolution 104, 85th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 294). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MURRAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H. R. 5883. A bill to provide for the discontinuance of the Postal Savings System; without amendment (Rept. No. 295). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H. R. 6597. A bill declaring the inundation of property because of, or aggravated by, wind, waves, or tidal effects on the Great Lakes to be properly within the flood-control activities of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 6598. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, with respect to procedures on applications for facility licenses, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 6599. A bill to amend the provisions of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended (7 U. S. C. 181), relating to practices in the marketing of livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H. R. 6600. A bill to provide Federal support for State defense forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 6601. A bill to provide for the appointment, designation, or detail of United States property and fiscal officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 6602. A bill to provide for the establishment of a commission to study the shortage of doctors of medicine in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6603. A bill to provide for the control of certain advertising on federally owned or controlled lands adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to encourage such control on other lands adjacent to such National System; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 6604. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, with respect to procedures on applications for facility licenses, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 6605. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow under retirement age may continue to receive mother's insurance benefits (but at a reduced rate) even though none of the children of her deceased husband are any longer entitled to child's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS of Arkansas:

H. R. 6606. A bill to amend section 306 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949; as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 6607. A bill to provide for the transfer of the assets of the Colorado Rural Rehabilitation Corp. to the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOEVEN:

H. R. 6608. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to provide for expansion and more effective administration of the Federal crop insurance programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MUMMA:

H. R. 6609. A bill to amend the War Contractors Relief Act with respect to the definition of a request for relief, to authorize consideration and settlement of certain claims of subcontractors, to provide reasonable compensation for services of partners and proprietors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 6610. A bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 6611. A bill to amend the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to eliminate certain inequities and restrictions and permit a more effective distribution of Federal funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H. R. 6612. A bill to provide financial assistance for the rehabilitation of orchards destroyed or damaged by natural disaster; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 6613. A bill to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, so as to authorize the inclusion in agricultural conservation programs under such act of activities carried out in connection with the reestablishment of orchards destroyed by production disasters; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WAINWRIGHT:

H. R. 6614. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 6615. A bill to amend part II of title III of the Communications Act of 1934, so as to require the installation of an automatic radio-telegraph call selector on cargo ships of the United States carrying less than 2 radio operators, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAY:

H. Con. Res. 159. Concurrent resolution to provide for the appointment of a special joint committee to study and report upon the need for proceeding with the extension of the Capitol at this time; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 222. Resolution to provide for the appointment of a special committee to investigate and report upon the need for a new House Office Building at this time; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds to stimulate the production of certain critical minerals, metals, and materials indispensable in the construction of jet engines; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNS of Hawaii:

H. R. 6616. A bill for the relief of John Moe and Lani Raymon Moe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 6617. A bill for the relief of Murgdicke Azadagolu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 6618. A bill for the relief of Goon Shee (Goon Ju Hai); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLEY:

H. R. 6619. A bill for the relief of Denyse-Teresa (Sarkou) Telesco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. R. 6620. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Marianna C. Pirro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6621. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jane Barnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 6622. A bill for the relief of Charles W. Duncan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLSON:

H. R. 6623. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States in Massachusetts to the Woods Hole Yacht Club; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 6624. A bill for the relief of Lum Guey Ngeung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAUND (by request):

H. R. 6625. A bill for the relief of Concepcion Contreras-Alvarado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 6626. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Luisa E. Baier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 6627. A bill for the relief of Victor C. Swearingen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 6628. A bill for the relief of Mary Pecek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 6629. A bill for the relief of Aris-tidis Veloudos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

192. Mr. BUSH presented a petition of citizens of Renovo, Clinton County, Pa., in opposition to H. R. 58, which would require veterans seeking hospitalization or domiciliary care in Veterans' Administration facilities to make a declaration with respect to insurance, property, income, expenditures, and worth, designed as an aid in determining ability to defray necessary expenses, which was referred to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.